

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. XVI

JANUARY, 1931

No. 1

EDITORIAL

IF THERE BE GROUND FOR THE HOPE THAT THE TIDE OF religious unbelief has reached its low ebb and is turning, then we may expect that the supernatural element in the Scriptures will soon command greater attention. The state of the world morally, socially, economically, and politically is at least serving the purpose of making people take a more serious view of life. Things cannot stand still. Either a godless and cynical pessimism must spread, or there must be a return to the realization that the Almighty is still to be reckoned with.

In the latter case there is bound to be a new examination of the ways in which God manifests Himself to men. The church, especially the ministry, must be ready to meet such a changed attitude. Moreover, when men begin in earnest to inquire after God, neither a cold Theism nor a hesitating Christian apologetic is going to satisfy them. There must be positive declarations respecting His nature and His self-revelation.

This prospect invites new interest in miracles, their nature and purpose, an interest that Dr. Sloan stimulates in *A Study of the Biblical Supernatural*. Here, instead of abstract reasoning as to their possibility and use, we have a classification of the miracles recorded in both Testaments, the various terms used to designate them, their concentration chiefly in three periods of

Israel's history, and the contrast between these accounts and ethnic wonder stories. Of special importance is the discussion of the way Christ regarded His miracles and of the moral intent of Biblical miracles generally.

The whole paper brings this important subject to us in a way to lift the miracle far above the position of a mere "wonder," and to give it its logical and important place in the economy of divine revelation.

CHRISTIAN HISTORY HAS SEEN PERIODS WHEN AUTHORITY was so firmly entrenched that one was not even allowed to express an adverse opinion. But time brings strange reactions. Now it is quite in order to have no decided opinion that depends upon authority. Freedom from all restraint is for some minds almost a religion in itself.

To acknowledge a Christian faith positive enough in its assurance and definite enough in its objects to supply both motive and restraint for life is held to "date" one—to class him as bound by the standards of a bygone generation that did not comprehend intellectual freedom. Prevalent views of this sort have produced widespread spiritual paralysis and moral laxity. But this detrimental impatience of authority and failure to grasp the true meaning of liberty of soul are not passing unnoticed, as is evidenced by such utterances as that of Professor McClain, *Current Tendencies Which Limit Faith and Life*.

This is a thoughtful analysis of trends that are arising from this anarchistic spirit of the times, such as "the vogue of vagueness," "oversimplification in attempted accounts of Christianity," "attempts to define Christianity without paying due regard to its historical and experiential facts," and "the bias which often accompanies narrow and specialized views of life." In con-

nection with this last proclivity particular attention is paid to education.

But this article is not confined to the negative side of the case, for Professor McClain devotes his closing pages to showing that Christianity is a constructive power that "deals with all of life—life as it really is," that it meets man at the critical and mystifying and disheartening and perilous points in life by bringing him into contact with the great Fact that resolves all questions, that is, the transcendent Person, God in Christ.

Those who remember Professor McClain's paper on the Kenosis will turn to this one with particular interest.

THERE ARE MANY SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE training and work of the ministry, just as there are for improving everything else. Some ideas are important, others not so much so; but there is one thing that should be impressed on the theological student as of prime importance in his study of the Bible and as bound to have a most helpful influence upon his preaching. This is the knowledge and habitual use of his Greek New Testament.

To many, it is true, the study of any language is irksome, but no one can meet the requirements for the collegiate work that must precede a modern theological seminary course without considerable language work. If he expects to enter the regular pastorate no language he studies can be so directly related to his preaching as the Greek of the New Testament. To major in it is therefore the part of wisdom.

There is another point here. Never, since those manuscripts of the Greek Testament that have come down to us began to be translated into other tongues, have there been such facilities in this field of study as

the student can command today. This is made clear by Dr. Robertson's brief but valuable paper on *New Ideas and Methods of Study in the Greek New Testament*. One is impressed at once by the character and the amount of scholarship devoted to the subject. The author first gives us some historical and descriptive paragraphs, then turns to the contributions that the papyri and comparative philology have made, and afterward takes up lexicons, grammars, critical commentaries, and translations.

The reading of this short article will lead the thoughtful Bible student—in the ministry or preparing for it—to realize that in his Greek Testament, rightly used, he has a commentary second to none.

AN APPALLING NUMBER OF PEOPLE WITH A SMATTERING knowledge of this and that are morbidly anxious to "break into print." And so our shelves are overloaded with books and articles abounding with more or less misinformation on subjects of all sorts. This is the superficial scholar's millennium, and he is making the most of it. Religion is especially infested with persons of this type, who add to a real religious zeal an ambition for scholarly recognition.

We might almost wish for something on the order of a general literary commission, to pass on a writer's qualifications before granting him a license to publish his views and add to our printed burden. Fortunately many productions of the less weighty sort never get much beyond the complimentary copy stage, though commercial publishers strive to sell them to people seeking authoritative utterance in various fields.

If one is going to be a scholar in any line he must make up his mind to endless and wearisome research, for

which few have either the capacity or persistence. In his paper, *Do We Really Try to Understand?* Dr. Magoun shows us the results of insufficient scholarship, more particularly in Biblical matters, though he gives an interesting dissertation on mistakes made in the effort to interpret ancient writers on music, due to lack of thoroughness on the part of translators. While conservative respecting the Bible, his views are the result of an earnest desire to come to a clearer understanding of its actual language as it stands, and to show how easy it is for anyone to be led astray in any field of research, unless he exercises the most meticulous care.

OF LATE SCIENCE HAS BEEN DEVELOPING A DISPOSITION to admit its own limitations, and even to acknowledge an ultimate power superior to natural law. This is not true of all scientists, of course, for there are notable cases of reverent acknowledgment and even active faith among them. When men like Eddington openly accept the principle of divine origin and control of the universe, the argument for the reasonableness and the necessity of a supernatural revelation is greatly strengthened.

It seems, then, an appropriate time to consider such a subject, and Dr. Dawson does this in his paper, *Science and Divine Revelation*. The writer is the son of a distinguished scientist, the late Sir J. William Dawson. His own position in the scientific world is indicated by the fact that he is a McGill University gold medalist in geology and natural science; Fellow, Royal Society of Canada; member, Institution of Civil Engineers, London, with gold medal; member, Canadian Institute of Civil Engineers; Laureate, Academy of Sciences, Paris, with two prizes; and has for many years held an important position under the Marine Depart-

ment of his government. That is, he is not a Christian apologist with a smattering of science to flavor what he writes, but an earnest believer who has the scientific training to make a discriminating appraisal of the matters under consideration.

The early part of the paper is devoted to the limitations of science. Here "the methods of science," "the theories of science," and "knowledge beyond science" are briefly dealt with. Then the author turns to "the highest realities," and from this point on we have a believing scientist's logical defense of Christianity. The whole is another contribution to the literature that gives a reason for the faith that is in one.

BEGINNING WITH THIS ISSUE WE HOPE TO PUBLISH A series of brief exegetical notes upon important passages. Probably no feature will be more welcome to the preacher and trained Bible teacher.

Professor Osborn, of the department of theology and apologetics in The Biblical Seminary in New York and one of our associate editors, contributes such notes this time, as we trust he will often do in coming numbers. Under the heading, *Divine Wrath and Human History*, he gives an exegesis of Romans 1:18-25.

THE BOOKS REVIEWED IN THE PRESENT NUMBER COVER as many distinct subjects in the religious field as there are titles in the list given below:

The Present Crisis in Religion.—Orchard.

The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity.—Baillie.

The Supreme Book of Mankind.—McClure.

Dan Crawford.—Tilsley.

Foursquare.—Rathbone.

The Holy Kabbalah.—Waite.

Word Pictures in the New Testament.—Robertson.

R. M. K.

A STUDY OF THE BIBLICAL SUPERNATURAL

By HENRIE PAUL FLOAN, D.D.

THE SUPERNATURAL IN RELIGION

THE SUPERNATURAL is foremost in the whole field of religion. If the supernatural be eliminated, religion itself is destroyed. Again, if the supernatural be seen as a mere lawless marvel, religion suffers in the appreciation of all morally sensitive people. To illustrate, the Buddhist story of Guatama's conflicts with enemies, who came against him riding on elephants a hundred and fifty miles high and throwing at him the mountains which were turned into wreaths when they touched his head, is quite unbelievable. The same is true of the story told about Jesus in the *Prot Evangelium Jacobi* to the effect that as a lad of twelve years He had made sparrows out of mud, thrown them into the air, and caused them to fly away singing. Mere lawless non-moral marvels such as these are far from convincing.

The supernatural, if it is to be preserved, must be seen as the expression of an orderly mind and as revealing a serious moral purpose in its every manifestation. If the Scriptures disclose such a supernatural modern-mind, in so far as it is experienced in fundamental thinking, we will be able to accept it, and to rejoice in it. If, on the contrary, they should disclose a whimsical, lawless, nonmoral supernatural, it would be very difficult for anyone capable of basic thinking to accept it. We turn to the Bible itself and survey its total portrait of miracles.

CLASSIFICATION OF THE BIBLICAL SUPERNATURAL

Bible miracles, for convenience in study, may be divided into five classes:

1. The supernatural in divine subjective self-disclosures and prophetic vision.
2. The supernatural in divine providences.
3. The supernatural in divine judgments.
4. The supernatural in portents and signs.
5. The supernatural in works of divine healing and helpfulness.

There are to be seen certain differences in the manifestations of the supernatural between these classifications. In the largest group of all, that of the divine subjective self-disclosures and prophetic foreknowledge, the supernatural is entirely mental and spiritual. In other groups the phenomena themselves may appear to be natural, being supernatural only in their time relation to God's redemptive program. In yet other groups there appears a new manifestation of divine creative force.

Of course, it is true that a discussion of the metaphysics of being and force will disclose no distinction between the natural and the supernatural. God is present and willing in the ordinary processes of nature in precisely the same way, and with precisely the same immanence, as He is in the supernatural signs and works recorded in Scripture. The natural is ceaselessly streaming from His will. In every sunset that glorifies our sky God is willing. He was willing no more, and no more immediately, when He answered Elijah's prayer with fire from heaven. There is not more of God in one than in the other. The difference is that, in one God's thought is independent; in the other His thought is in correspondence with the thoughts and needs of Elijah.

He is as present in one act as in the other. This must be clear to every theistic thinker; but from the point of view of man's sin-darkened understanding He is not as manifest. An illustration will make the distinction clear. A mother's love is doubtless as much the motive of her daily round of faithful toil as it would be of some act of unusual self-sacrifice. This will instantly be admitted. But, though there be no difference in the motivating love, there will be a very great difference in the manifestness of that love from the selfish point of view of her family.

This difference in manifestness is certainly of great significance in the cure of sin; for it will of course be recognized that it is sinful man's awareness of God, quite as much as the fact of His presentness, that has redemptive value. Sin has made us all dull to every sublimity. We are not only dull to the reality of God, but we are also slow to see even ordinary nobilities of life. What wonder, then, that the orderly God should use the extraordinary to make our darkened hearts aware of Him.

It might easily be true to a fully spiritual mind that God would be better seen in the majestic orderliness of nature than He could be in some extraordinary or extranatural activity; but the point is without significance, for God is not disclosing Himself to fully spiritual minds. He is disclosing Himself to man's sin-darkened understanding. It needs ever to be born in mind that the Biblical revelation is redemptive. It is a revelation to men who are abnormal because of sin. God must reveal Himself to men as they are; to men whose hearts are proud, and whose understandings are self-intoxicated. In every effort to comprehend God's dealings and self-disclosures, this human factor must be

given full consideration. Revelation is not simply an expression of God's perfect thought, but of God's perfect thought as it can come through to proud and wilful men. So God's words and providences in dealing with Israel at the Exodus are one thing, and God's words and providences at the climax of history in Jesus Christ are another; yet both are God's perfect truth when seen in relation to the receiving minds to whom they were addressed.

CONCENTRATION OF THE BIBLICAL SUPERNATURAL

Turning now again to the Biblical record of supernatural occurrences, we notice first of all this striking fact about them: They are largely concentrated in three periods of Israel's history. There is little of the supernatural in the time of the patriarchs or before. There is a period of miracles during the Exodus and the conquest, 1602-1522 (or 1448-1380) B.C., eighty years; after this they largely disappear for more than half a millennium. There is a second period of miracles at the reformation under Elijah and Elisha, 870-806 B.C., sixty-four years. The third period is at the manifestation of Messiah, 27-62 A.D., thirty-five years. Of these three periods the third is by far the greatest; there were more miracles wrought during the thirty-five years from the baptism of Jesus to the imprisonment of St. Paul at Rome than in the rest of the Bible put together. And not only is this true, but the miracles of this period are by far the greatest, and they show a widely different character.

But we are going too fast. Consider first these three periods together. They are all three great moral and spiritual turning points in God's redemptive program. At the Exodus God was taking one nation out from the midst of another, and setting it up in its own land. He

was establishing a redeemer-nation, consecrated to maintaining the faith of ethical monotheism, in the midst of the surrounding corruptions of polytheism. It was a tremendous undertaking. It was a unique development in history. It required the extraordinary for its accomplishment; God gave the extraordinary because it was redemptively necessary. Afterward the extraordinary largely disappeared.

In the second period God was recovering a nation to its ideals. Israel had been corrupted by the polytheism in the midst of which it lived. The superstitions of the surrounding nations had darkened the splendor of its light. The extraordinary was again necessary; God gave it. He manifested Himself through it. He turned back the tides of superstition. He recovered Israel to its ethical and monotheistic faith.

The third period is at the consummation of Israel's work as the redeemer-nation. God Himself was coming into human history against the background of Israel's national life, and by the way of the womb of a virgin of its tribes. An undertaking so stupendous must not fail in adequate expression. When God comes in personal immediacy into history His character and glory must stand clearly revealed. We must see His holiness. We must see His grace. We must see His power. Here again the extraordinary is necessary; and it was given.

And so at each time when there was a concentration of supernatural works there was a pressing moral need for such divine self-disclosure. To assert that the same results could have been accomplished without the miracles is a doctrinaire rather than a scientific position. The fact is that Israel's religious faith is a unique fact in history; and the uniqueness of the fact itself should

give the careful thinker pause in setting aside the reasonable Biblical record to affirm a strictly ordinary cause for unique and extraordinary results.

THE BIBLICAL SUPERNATURAL CONTRASTED WITH ETHNIC WONDER STORIES

This fact which we have briefly developed is of utmost significance—the supernatural in the Bible is largely concentrated at three crucial points in Israel's history. But not only so; these turning points are all of them, relatively speaking, late. They occurred at times when the historical point of view was well developed. The Exodus stands against the background of the abounding civilization of Egypt. The reformation under Elijah-Elisha occurred during the splendor of Ahab's reign in Israel. The coming of Christ found Palestine a part of the magnificent Greco-Roman civilization. Jerusalem lay within some three hundred and fifty miles both of Alexandria and of Antioch, the second and third cities of the Roman Empire respectively.

The Biblical supernatural is thus immediately lifted out of the classification of ethnic wonder stories. Its miracles occur at the wrong times and under the wrong circumstances for such a classification. There should have been the most of miracle back in the early narratives of Genesis, where there is the least; and there should have been the least of miracle in the record of Jesus, where there is most. Wonder stories, so we are told, belong to the childhood of the race. They tend constantly to become fewer, and even to disappear as history and civilization develop. This designation is doubtless correct; but the important thing is that it cannot be applied to the Biblical supernatural, for in the Bible wonders are largely wanting just where they

should appear, and are most abundant just where they should not appear. Negative criticism faces a most serious problem in these circumstances, if it means to insist upon denying or explaining away the Biblical, especially the New Testament, miracle. John the Baptist performed no miracles. Why should miracles be invented about Jesus? How could such startling miracles, and miracles so different from those which had been narrated of the Old Testament characters, be developed about Jesus? And how could these stories be believed by men and women who were in a position to put the question of their truth or untruth to first-hand investigation? Criticism will find itself embarrassed to answer these questions.

WORDS USED TO NAME THE BIBLICAL SUPERNATURAL

Several words are used to name the Biblical supernatural. (See list at end of this article.) Most of them carry the force either of sign or wonder. One of them is variously translated sign, wonder, and miracle. Professor Robert Dick Wilson gives a list of seven which he translates by the English "sign," Greek *semeion*. He also gives a list of three which he renders by the English "wonder," Greek *teras*. These cover the principal Old Testament usage. In addition Dr. Wilson notices two words with the meaning of wonderful acts. One means destruction; the other is a derivative of the Hebrew, to create, and is translated "a new creation," or a new thing. The important fact to notice is that the idea of wonder, the wonderful, is in emphasis. The supernatural works of God in the Old Testament were acts which moved the heart of man to wonder.

In the New Testament there are closely similar words; but Jesus' own usage shows a striking modifica-

tion. The word for wonder, the Greek *teras*, appears only in His criticism of the wonder-hungry point of view of His generation. The word sign, Greek, *semeion*, appears only once in the usage of Jesus to name His miracles. He uses this also in criticism of the point of view of His generation. He uses it to name the miracles which false messiahs will work. He uses it in connection with the events that will be the setting for His own glorious return at the end of the ages; but only when He is speaking of the enthusiasm of the people because of the miracle of the multiplication of loaves does Jesus use the word "sign" as His own description of His supernatural works.

Jesus' word for miracle is "work," *ergon*. He uses also *dunamis*, "mighty work"; but here also in every instance He is thinking of the impression His miracles have made upon others. In His own independent, intimate thought these supernaturals were works, redemptive works, a part of His total redemptive toil, and no more. The fact is most significant. It is one of those unconscious testimonies to the reliability of the Gospel record which are so convincing. St. Paul uses "wonder," St. Luke uses "wonder." "Wonder" was used by the Jews of Jesus' day. It was in their thought; but Jesus never uses it. To Him His miracles were not wonderful; they were simply "works," and this peculiarity in His point of view comes out in the unconscious language of the records. Only a supernatural point of view could possibly lift itself clear of wonder in contemplating the miracles of Jesus. That our Lord should be presented as having used uniformly the ordinary word for work in His own intimate thought about His miracles is a striking circumstance and a most convincing evidence of their truth.

PECULIARITY OF NEW TESTAMENT MIRACLE

This difference between the Old Testament and the New in their terminology of miracles extends also into their nature. Miracles in the times of Moses and Elijah and miracles in the time of Jesus are decidedly different. In the Old Testament there is very much of judgment, and almost nothing of healing. In the New Testament this situation is exactly reversed. Take the figures: The Old Testament records some twenty-eight miracles of judgment; the New Testament only three. The Old Testament records only three miracles of healing; in the New Testament these works are literally innumerable. There is a record in detail of thirty-nine such miracles by Jesus. In addition the Evangelists record eleven large groups of Jesus' healing miracles where no details are given. Besides these there are other large groups performed by the Twelve, the Seventy, and by the Apostolic Church.

The Old Testament miracles, then, were signs, wonders, portents, and often they were startling judgments upon sin; but they were seldom acts of healing grace. The New Testament miracles, on the contrary, were almost constantly such acts of grace—an inherent part of God's total redemptive self-manifestation. They were wonder-full, but they were never mere wonders; and this word is never used by Jesus to describe them. The New Testament miracles were, as we have said, a part of the total divine redemptive self-disclosure in Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son.

THE ETHICAL QUALITY OF THE BIBLICAL SUPERNATURAL

We have come here upon a very important fact, namely, the ethical quality and orderliness of the Biblical super-

natural. The Biblical miracle is as orderly as the law-abiding stars. It is never a mere whimsical wonder. It stands in constant relation to the ethical purposes of the Holy God. We get a suggestion of this moral orderliness in the fact of striking differences between miracles in the Old and New Testament periods. It is entirely fitting that at the epoch of the Exodus God's supernaturals should be national judgments and deliverances. It is equally fitting that His self-manifestation should take a like form during the great reformation under Elijah-Elisha. But at the coming of Messiah in healing grace there is a new stage in God's redemptive self-disclosure; and the new stage requires a new type of miracles. Messiah is revealing the divine purpose to lift man out of limitation into the fulness and power of the perfect image of God. Disease and death and infirmity must disappear. How fitting that the miracles of this period should thus prophesy man's final triumph!

But let us examine this matter of the ethical character, the moral orderliness, of the Biblical supernatural a little more carefully. Whether we are dealing with the Old Testament or the New, we find that Biblical miracles invariably display a moral relationship. The fire which came in answer to Elijah's prayer was not a willful wonder provided simply to exalt Elijah. It was instead a divine certification of Jehovah's moral dealings with Israel. Israel has sinned, and God has sent the work of drought by Elijah, a judgment upon its sin. God now authenticates both that moral judgment and His servant Elijah in the answer by fire. The whole situation is saturated with ethical significance.

Again, the great plagues under Moses were similarly judgments upon a people's sin. The same is true of the overwhelming of the Canaanites under Joshua. Israel's

own deliverances were constantly conditioned upon national righteousness. The ethical is in uninterrupted emphasis throughout the Old Testament. In the Biblical writings God's providential and supernatural manifestations have always this moral and redemptive quality. As we have already pointed out, they are never willful; they are never arbitrary or whimsical works.

Coming on down into the New Testament we find the same ethical atmosphere. The angelic appearances which introduce the coming of Messiah seem a fit setting for an event so stupendous. Being thus redemptively appropriate they are ethical, for the ethical is the morally appropriate. The same is true of the Virgin Birth. It may not have been a necessary condition of the Incarnation; but it seems quite clear that it was and is a necessary condition to faith in the Incarnation. It is historically true that faith in the Incarnation has not persisted where the Virgin Birth has been denied. The Messianic star was probably not supernatural. God, who knows all time, simply related the Incarnation and the constellations. The supernatural witness to Jesus at His baptism, transfiguration, and after the Greeks came to see Him are such a recognition as one would expect the ethical God to give to His incarnate Son. The mysterious darkness and earthquake of Golgotha are needed as the physical background and setting for the Cross. The supreme tragedy of the ages, a tragedy of universal proportions, must have its appropriate universal setting. Had April not hidden its splendors behind a veil of night when the Son of God was taking upon Himself the guilt of human sin it would have been a violation of all moral sincerity and all poetic fitness.

This leaves us the miracles of Jesus and of the Apos-

tolie Church. With the exception of thirteen, these are miracles of healing, works of redeeming grace, the moral significance of which no one will question. We hastily review the thirteen exceptions.

The miraculous catch of fish was a marvel used to call hesitant and fearful disciples back to whole-hearted allegiance. It said to Peter and his friends that human weakness and failure can ever be turned into victory by the power of the co-operating Christ. It was like the promise after the Resurrection: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The repetition of this miracle by the risen Jesus after the second failure of the apostolic group is a sublimity of tenderness and of teaching wisdom. It was a renewing of their earlier call, and would be enriched with the memory of the former experience. Jesus' multiplication of the loaves and fishes was in the first instance a great religious object lesson through which He sought to enforce upon His followers the truth that He was their Passover, their supernatural manna, their living bread. In the second instance it was a work of tender sympathy for human hunger and need.

The stilling of the tempest was necessary to the continued ministry of Jesus and the Twelve, for the storm was just about to overwhelm the little boat in which they were sailing. It was also, as were all His miracles, a manifestation of His divine glory, the recognition of which was necessary before His death and resurrection could be redemptively preached. His walking upon the water was another powerful manifestation of His deity. It seems to have startled the Twelve into a momentary recognition of the true glory of Messiah's Person. It stands at the beginning of those months of retirement and meditation which Jesus spent with the Twelve out-

side Palestine. At the end of this period Jesus asks them: "Whom say ye that I, the Son of man, am?" Their answer is a deliberate reaffirmation of that earlier flashing vision: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," said Peter. Directly afterward came the Transfiguration. His divine glory having been discovered in their hearts, it is now fully manifest to their eyes. This is always the divine moral order; inward faith ever precedes outward vision. Certainly all of this is deeply moral; it is full of moral significance.

Then there was the withering of the fig tree. It has often been criticized, but the criticism is shallow. A fig tree is a thing, not a person. It has no desert. In any event, what higher purpose could a wayside fig tree serve than to teach an important moral lesson? The incident had great moral and didactic force. It spoke with burning earnestness to the apostolic group that same moral message Jesus had so often put in words, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites."

The miracle of turning water into wine might be interpreted as Jesus' everlasting protest against asceticism, self-denial for the sake of self-denial. Such things had no place in the religion which was to bring men more abundant life. Jesus therefore began His ministry by a work which vividly teaches that every expression of life consistent with love is precious in the eyes of the Holy God. The overwhelming of the soldiers with the awe of His majesty, if it be a miracle, was a fitting prelude to the self-surrender of the Son of God to the abuse and torture of His cross. It adds a new moral splendor to that manifestation of His divine sacrifice.

This leaves the miracle of the coin in the mouth of the fish and the New Testament's three miracles of judgment, the death of Ananias and Sapphira and the tem-

porary blindness of Elamis. These miracles of judgment present no problem from the point of view of their having had a moral significance. A church which would have to endure fiery trial successfully could not have its foundations laid in moral compromise. The loveliness of New Testament grace must never be confused by a weak toleration of falsehood and hypocrisy. As to Elamis, his temporary blindness would inevitably be a means of grace to himself as well as to the Proconsul who witnessed this judgment come upon him. We are left, now, with the miracle of the coin in the mouth of the fish. The moral significance of this work is not immediately apparent. But one exception to a rule that holds good somewhere near two hundred times is no difficulty. The principle is established. We wait for fuller knowledge to give us the explanation of one apparent exception.

THE BIBLICAL WRITERS CONSCIOUS THAT MIRACLES ARE A DIVINE AUTHENTICATION

We next turn to the attitude of the Bible and of the Biblical characters involved toward these supernatural events. Was there a definite recognition of them as manifesting God and as certifying His prophets? Was there a feeling that they were exceptional, that they differed from the ordinary wonders and wonder stories current in paganism? The answer to all of these questions is an emphatic Yes.

Whether it is Moses, Elijah, some one of the devotional writers in the book of Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, one of the Minor Prophets, St. Luke, St. John, St. Paul, or Jesus the Lord Himself—everywhere there is a realization that God is revealed in these supernatural phenomena; everywhere it is seen that they do certify His

servants; and repeatedly there is a claim that they are unique.

The miracles of Moses are placed in contrast to the magic of Egyptians in Exodus 7:8-13. This is repeated again and again.

In Deuteronomy there is a description of the uniqueness of God's self-manifestation in the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt. The words burn with conviction:

For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God created man upon the earth, and ask from the one side of heaven unto the other, whether there hath been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it?

Did ever people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard, and live?

Or hath God assayed to go and take him a nation from the midst of another nation, by temptations, by signs, and by wonders, and by war, and by a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm, and by great terrors, according to all that the Lord your God did for you in Egypt before your eyes? [Deut. 4:32-34.]

Joshua, who speaks for the next generation, has the same idea:

Hereby ye shall know that the living God is among you, and that he will without fail drive out from before you the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Hivites, and the Perizzites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Jebusites.

Behold, the ark of the covenant of the Lord of all the earth passeth over before you into Jordan.

Now therefore take you twelve men out of the tribes of Israel, out of every tribe a man.

And it shall come to pass, as soon as the soles of the feet of the priests that bear the ark of the Lord, the Lord of all the earth, shall rest in the waters of Jordan, that the waters of Jordan shall be cut off from the waters that come down from above; and they shall stand upon a heap. [Joshua 3:10-13.]

Elijah expresses a like point of view in his sublime confidence at Carmel. He looks upon the religions of

the surrounding nations as vanity. He mocks the prophets of the Syrian Baal. Their deity is asleep or on a journey. But the God of Israel is different. His power cannot fail. He drenches the sacrifice with water. At the hour of evening sacrifice he prays:

Lord God of Abraham, Isaac, and of Israel, let it be known this day that thou art God in Israel, and that I am thy servant, and that I have done all these things at thy word.

Hear me, O Lord, hear me, that this people may know that thou art the Lord God, and that thou hast turned their heart back again. [1 Kings, 18:36-37.]

About this time there appears another prophet of Jehovah named Micaiah. He is a true prophet and his actual foreknowledge is contrasted with the flattering words of the false prophets through whom God does not speak. (See 1 Kings 22:9 ff.)

We find the same point of view in the times of the great Major Prophets. The book of Isaiah repeatedly contrasts the knowledge and power of Jehovah with the vanity of idols. Take as an illustration that fine passage:

Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else: I am God, and there is none like me,

Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure:

Calling a ravenous bird from the east, the man that executeth my counsel from a far country: yea, I have spoken it, I will also bring it to pass; I have purposed it, I will also do it. [Isa. 46:9-11.]

Compare also Isaiah 42:9; 44:1-20; 44:26-28; 45:11; 45:20-25; 47:11-14; 48:3; Jeremiah 10:2; 18:13-15; 28:5-17; 29:1 ff; Ezekiel 11:5; Psalms 78:1-32; 115:8-18; Amos 4:13; Daniel 14:18.

In view of these records it cannot be denied that

there was in Israel a sense of the uniqueness of its religious history. They felt that God was in it. They felt that God was revealing Himself to them through prophetic words and mighty supernatural signs, all of which were quite without parallel in the magic and divinations of the pagan nations round about. And this conclusion stands quite apart from any questions that may be raised by Old Testament criticism. At least as early as the time of the Major Prophets the power and truth of Jehovah was standing in vivid contrast to the vanity of the religions of the nations. Israel's God was the living God, who knew the end from the beginning, who manifested His purposes to His prophets in the sure words of truth and by mighty signs and judgments.

Turning to the New Testament we discover a similar point of view. Both Jesus and the apostles believed themselves to have supernatural powers, and they believed themselves to be divinely accredited by them. The Synoptists record Jesus' appeal to this accrediting no less than five times:

In St. Mark 2:10, when He claims the power to heal the paralytic and that this demonstrates His divine authority to forgive sin.

In St. Mark 5:10, when He sends the Gadara demoniac back home to testify concerning the work that has been wrought upon him.

In St. Luke 7:8, when He rejoices in the centurion's recognition of His absolute authority over nature.

In St. Luke 7:22, when He certifies Himself to John Baptist's messengers by His miracles.

In St. Matthew 11:20, when He upbraids the cities in which His mighty works had been done because of their unbelief.

The Fourth Gospel adds at least seven more in-

stances of this appeal by Jesus to His supernatural works:

In St. John 5:36 He says His works are a greater witness than John Baptist.

In St. John 7:21 He says, "I have done one work and ye all marvel" (the case of the impotent man, recorded in chap. 5).

In St. John 10:25 He speaks of the works which He does in His Father's Name as witnessing Him.

In St. John 10:37 He says, "If I do not the works of my Father believe me not."

In St. John 11:41-42 He prays, "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I know that thou hearest me always; but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me."

In St. John 14:11 He says, "Believe me for the works' sake."

In St. John 15:24 He says, "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin: but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father."

St. Luke has the same point of view. He sees the apostles certified in their witness to Jesus by the miracles which they wrought in His Name. In Acts 5:12-15 he describes how St. Peter and the rest of the apostles are recognized in Jerusalem because of their miracle-working power. There is a similar record with respect to St. Paul's ministry in Ephesus some twenty years later (Acts 19:11-12).

St. John expresses the same point of view as his own in the closing chapters of his Gospel. He says the miracles of Jesus evidence His Messiahship and Deity. (See 20:30-31; 21:25.)

St. Paul claims to have been divinely certified in his work among the Corinthians by signs, wonders, and mighty deeds, and he calls these "the signs of an apostle" (2 Cor. 12:12).

JESUS SUPPRESSES TALK ABOUT HIS MIRACLES

It may be pointed out, in contradiction to these facts, that Jesus Himself sought to avoid appearing as a wonder worker, and that He tried to keep people from talking about His supernatural works. We make no objection to this, for it is true; but we would answer that these later expressions must be studied in the light of the former. No statement of the position of Jesus can lay any claim either to scholarship or sincerity that omits or suppresses any part of the evidence. What then are the precise facts? We give several illustrations of our Lord's attitude.

In St. John 2:18-19 He evades the demand of the rulers for a sign at the first cleansing of the Temple. In 4:46-48 He criticizes the nobleman of Capernaum who met Him at Cana, desiring a miracle of healing. In St. Mark 1:25 Jesus silences the demonized man who is calling Him the Holy One of God. In 1:35-38 He goes away from the enthusiasm He had produced by healing all the sick of Capernaum, to preach in other cities. In 1:40-44 He heals a leper and commands him to be silent about it, going rather and showing himself to the priest as the Law provides. In 3:12 He heals a multitude by the sea of Galilee, again requiring silence of the demons. In 5:43 He requires the father and mother of Jairus to be still about the raising of their daughter from the dead. In 7:36, after His return from Tyre and Sidon, He heals a multitude at Decapolis, including a deaf man, and commands silence in

this case. Directly afterward, 8:22-26, He healed a blind man at Bethsaida and gave the same instructions. In 8:30 He charges the disciples not to proclaim their recognition of His divine glory. In 9:9, after the Transfiguration, He gives the same command, except that He now sets a time when He releases their lips. In St. Luke 9:41 He shows a disinclination to perform a miracle. He had before shown the same attitude while in the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. (See Matt. 15:21-23.) In St. Matthew 12:38-45 He refuses to work signs at the request of the scribes and Pharisees, saying that the sign of the prophet Jonah will alone be given. He repeats this in St. Matthew 16:1-5. He says miracles, no matter how wonderful, will not produce faith in ungodly hearts. This was spoken as He went up for the last time to Jerusalem, and it is recorded in St. Luke 16:31. At the very last He pays no attention to Herod when he desires to see some wonders at His hands, as related in St. Luke 23:8. This list may not be complete, but it is very nearly so.

The explanation of our Lord's attitude is apparent almost immediately in nearly every instance. In two the prohibited confessions were by demonized men. In one case it was explicitly a confession of His unique relation to God. Jesus could not accept the testimony of the demonized; especially He could not accept from them a premature testimony to His Deity. Two other instances when our Lord enjoined silence are partly similar to these first two. The apostles themselves could not be allowed to disclose His divine glory until after His resurrection from the dead. The reason is evident. This explains His command of silence after Peter's confession, and again after the Transfiguration.

After the crisis of Capernaum, which followed the

feeding of the five thousand, Jesus' interest during the next few months was centered upon the Twelve. He was drawing out their faith in His Deity. At the end of this period stand His question, "Whom say ye that I, the Son of man, am?" Peter's confession, and then the Transfiguration. This preoccupation explains His unwillingness to turn aside unto cures, and therefore His instructions, both at Decapolis and Bethsaida, that His mighty works should not be talked about. The wild enthusiasm of the people of Capernaum after He had healed the sick of a whole city would inevitably be spiritually defective, just as it was later on after the feeding of the five thousand. Jesus would of course withdraw Himself from such.

This leaves but two instances where Jesus enjoined silence upon those whom He had cured, the leper whom He cleansed near the beginning of His ministry, and the daughter of Jairus whom He raised from the dead near its close. It may be that in both cases Jesus was seeking to avoid further antagonizing of the rulers. Indeed, this may have been His motive also both at Decapolis and Bethsaida; for Jesus' mighty works greatly offended the rulers, and He could not yet allow their hatred to drag Him to the Cross—His hour had not yet come. But here is the important thing: Two unexplained instances when Jesus enjoined silence upon those whom He had cured cannot establish it as a fact either that He shrank from being, or from being known as, a worker of miracles. Jesus' miracles were, for His consciousness, as we have already pointed out, a part of His total redemptive toil. In so far as they were, He rejoiced in them and appealed to them; in so far as they were not, He sought to avoid them; in so far as they tended to hinder such toil, He sought to suppress them.

These principles, we believe, will be found to be the explanation of His attitude in every instance.

There is one other striking fact that is disclosed by a careful study of the miracles of Jesus, namely, that they are largely reduced toward the close of His life. There are few miracles during the first six months of the last year. During the last six months, when Jesus was constructing the background for His great summons to Israel in the triumphal entry, their number is again somewhat increased. The supreme miracle of His entire incarnate life, the raising of Lazarus from the dead, was wrought during those last months. There was a concentration of miracles in the Temple enclosure after the entry, which is noted in St. Matthew 21:14, and a last sublime act of grace and power noted in St. Luke 22:51, the healing of the ear of the High Priest's servant; but the supernatural is greatly reduced at the end of Jesus' earthly life. He was not then engaged with revealing the majesty of His Person. He was dying redemptively. He was preoccupied with His Cross. The supreme grace of atoning love then filled His whole horizon. He saw only sin's blight and ruin, and God's redeeming grace, its cure. This had always been His point of view; but now it was more intensely so. Even at the beginning of His ministry He looked at a palsied man, and saying, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," healed his body; but now He seems to see sin only. Sick bodies He passes by.

This peculiar circumstance has large evidential value. Any imaginative writer would certainly have felt the dramatic effect of picturing Jesus as performing cures even as He went to the Cross. The Evangelists do not so present Him. It is an evidence of the sober earnestness of their records. Neither imagination

nor tradition could have produced the deeply true arrangement of the supernatural which we have in the Gospels.

BIBLICAL WORDS SIGNIFYING THE SUPERNATURAL

We give a list of the chief Old and New Testament words used to name the Biblical supernatural:

Old Testament:—

Nes—sign, signal, ensign, Numbers 26:10.

Oth—sign, constant, equivalent of *semeion*. It is sometimes translated miracle.

Temah—miracle, wonder, three times in Daniel.

Pele—wonder, 44 times.

Mopheh—wonder, sign, miracle, 35 times.

Aliylah—mighty acts, doings, eight times in Psalms.

Shammah—an astonishment of desolation, 19 times.

Shemamah—an astonishment of desolation, 10 times.

Maaseyah—acts, with the feeling of wonder, 5 times.

New Testament:—

Semeion—46 times, 29 in the Synoptics, 17 in St. John.

Dunamis—12 times, but only in the Synoptics.

Ergon—18 times, 16 in St. John and once each in St. Matthew and St. Luke.

Teras—16 times, once each in St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. John, but only in criticism. It is used by St. Luke in the Acts, and by St. Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

Semeion is used as follows in the Gospels:

In St. Matthew Jesus uses it once in connection with His second coming, once of the miracles that will be performed by false messiahs, and seven times in criticism of the desires of the people to see wonders. It is used by others in this Gospel three times.

In St. Mark Jesus uses it twice in criticism of the desire to see wonders, and once in connection with false messiahs. It is used twice by others.

In St. Luke Jesus uses it four times in criticism, and twice of His return. Others use it five times.

In St. John Jesus uses it once in criticism, and once of His own point of view. Others use it 15 times.

HADDONFIELD, NEW JERSEY.

CURRENT TENDENCIES WHICH LIMIT FAITH AND LIFE

By ALVA J. McCLAIN

THE APOSTLE PAUL, valiant contender for the Christian faith, is never a mere speculative theologian defending a system of thought for its own sake. Neither is he greatly concerned to defend God, "as though he needed anything" from man. So far as God Himself is concerned, the Apostle doubtless felt that he could afford to ignore the petty negations of unbelief, knowing that "the foundation of God standeth sure." But their effect upon human life was another matter, one in which God Himself is infinitely concerned. And Paul, in his defense of the Christian faith, never loses sight of the vital relation between the completeness of Christian revelation and the fulness of the Christian life. With him it was not a question of what men might possibly get along without, and yet live. Men may live on a crust of bread, and those who prefer to do so have of course less trouble defending their possessions. But men do not thus live at their best. All the spiritual riches needed to make human life full and complete, the Apostle had found in Christ. To diminish Christ was to plunder the spiritual possibilities of human life. Hence his stern warnings against all tendencies of thought which might obscure or limit the revelation of Christ to men.

One of these warnings appears in the Colossian Epistle, most clearly expressing the implications of yielding to such tendencies: "Take heed lest there shall

be anyone that maketh spoil of you through his philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ: for in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and in him ye are made full" (2:8-10). The passage contains three important ideas which need constant emphasis in the irreconcilable conflict between Christianity and the rudiments of the world. Changing somewhat the order of their statement in the passage, these ideas are as follows: First, in Christianity the Person of Jesus Christ has all the fulness and value of God; He *is* God. Second, in Christ human life is made full and complete. Third, human life may be hindered from reaching its ideal fulness in Christ by reason of certain tendencies, philosophic and traditional, which limit the Christian message and mar its effectiveness. It is this last line of thought which I shall follow in this paper, but the first two should be kept in mind because they constitute the background of the entire discussion.

One of the most apparent tendencies in the modern religious world is what may be termed *the vogue of vagueness* in theological matters. This is a curious characteristic of the modern religious mind, especially curious because science is the ruling spirit of the present hour, and to science vagueness is one of the unpardonable sins. The scientific method, to which the world is so greatly indebted, demands clarity and exactness in term, formula, definition, and statement. Yet strange to say, when the Christian thinker attempts to employ the same method in the statement of his faith he is confronted by an almost intolerant opposition. The physicist who labors for years to give the world an exact formula is applauded, but the Christian investigator under similar circumstances is often condemned as a

splitter of theological hairs. It is permitted us to use such terms as "God" and "Christ" and "immortality" and "atonement," but we must be careful not to make any very definite assertions about them.

This seeming passion for vagueness indicates, for one thing, a spirit of intellectual indolence in the field of religion. For vagueness is the beloved refuge of sluggish minds. It makes accuracy unnecessary, relieves the sharp travail of thinking, and settles all differences by turning out the lights. As a labor-saving device, it has obvious advantages. An acquaintance of mine used to have difficulty with the spelling of the word friend. So he always wrote the *i* and the *e* exactly alike, and carefully placed the dot midway between them. By this rather simple expedient he spared himself the labor of mastering the correct spelling, and at the same time escaped the humiliation of ignorance. A certain type of modern religious thinking is like this. Berkeley used to say, "We first raise a dust, and then complain that we cannot see." With a slight change, the philosopher's charge might be applied to the type of thinking which I have in mind. They first raise a dust, and then declare that they *can* see.

It has been argued, of course, that exactness in matters of religion is not possible as it is in the case of the natural sciences. Without bothering to deny such an argument, it will be sufficient to point out that, for purposes of discussion and communication, exact terms are essential. They make the work of different investigators available to each other. They make it possible to teach ideas. It is not in the first instance a question of whether any one religion is either true or false; but, if we are to study the field of religion at all, we must find terms with some degree of definite meaning. Even if

all religion were false, as some would have it, still we could not play fast and loose in our discussions of it. There is little use, certainly, in forbidding the use of ancient terms in new senses. No one can stop that. But what we should object to—in the interest of clear thinking, at least—is this shifting of the meanings of traditional religious terms without due explanation. If someone, for example, wishes to identify God with the social mind of humanity, there is no way to prevent him. Only such a one should explain his meaning when he solemnly affirms, “I believe in God the Father.”

Definiteness in the religious field is highly desirable, if for no other reason than that it is in the interest of intelligent discussion. And definiteness is possible in our discussions of Christianity. I do not mean that one can exhaust the Christian faith by any statement of it. There is always a vast overplus which escapes all our terms and definitions. But this does not mean that we can make no definite affirmations at all; for we can.

Another trend in modern religious thought is *oversimplification in attempted accounts of Christianity*. There is a constant striving to reduce Christianity to the lowest common denominator, to find some term or idea that will explain it all. Just now the popular catchwords are “service” and “love.” Love, we are told, is the greatest thing in the world; love will solve all our problems; love is Christianity; Christianity is love. The refutation of this naïve viewpoint is best accomplished by pointing out that *what* a man loves is really the important thing. It is not enough to know that a man loves God. What kind of God does he love? That is the crucial point and the surest index of character. But this desire to simplify Christianity is not peculiar to the artless and uncritical mind; it may be found also in the

realm of critical scholarship. The motive and results are quite different, but the principle is the same.

Various considerations have given impetus to this tendency toward oversimplification. For one thing, it seems to promise much in the direction of eliminating religious controversy, a thing which is no longer in good standing. Actually, of course, it works only so long as men will agree to ask no questions. Then also we must not omit that natural bent of the human mind, best represented by the philosophers, who for many centuries have been searching for one element or idea which will explain everything else. And I am quite willing to admit that there is a compelling fascination in explanations which seem to simplify. But all such explanations are attended with certain grave dangers.

In the first place, there is the danger of omitting matters of importance which may stand outside our neat little formulas and refuse to yield. By certain modern schools of thought this has been exalted into a definite technique. If something particularly thorny appears in the path of your investigation, you merely deny its existence, and lo, the problem is solved. Thus the "problem of knowledge" in philosophy has been solved; the "mind" in psychology; and the "supernatural" in Christianity. One recalls the case of the impatient old German professor who, confronted with a rock specimen which upset a geological theory of his, simply stepped to an open window and threw the offending specimen into the street. It is not at all unusual to find men, claiming to be guided by the scientific spirit, who treat the facts of Christianity in much the same short and hasty manner. Having made up their minds in advance, that religion can be explained wholly on naturalistic principles, the Virgin Birth, the Resurrec-

tion, and all other miracles are impatiently tossed out the window. They do not fit the formula.

In the second place, through oversimplification there is always the danger that Christianity will be made over into a rather pale and uninteresting religious philosophy. It was William James who once suggested that, from a certain abstract viewpoint, violin music, even when produced by a master, might be described as the "scraping of horses' tails over cats' bowels." Such a definition of course has the merit of simplicity; it gets rid of all the mystery of personality and genius, but the residue is not very interesting. Certainly it could not provide the inspiration necessary for the development of great music and musicians. It is no less certain that an oversimplified form of Christianity will never win men in large numbers to the Christian life, however much it may intrigue a few academic minds with a passion for simplicity and completeness of explanation.

The most important things in life, from the standpoint of human interest, are not as a rule the simplest. And this is strikingly true of Christianity. "Christianity has more than one dimension. It has height and depth as well as breadth." Any facile explanation which gets rid of all the profound mystery and fascinating richness in Christianity is certain to fail at last in its appeal to men. Take the Person of Christ, for example. How can Deity and true humanity be perfectly united in one person? That has always been one of the difficult intellectual problems of the Christian faith. Yet it is just at this point that Christian experience has found its richest satisfactions—in a Saviour who was "in all points tempted like as we are," and who is at the same time "over all, God blessed forever," infinitely able to meet all our needs.

A third tendency should be noted, represented by the popular *attempts to define Christianity without paying due regard to its historical and experiential facts*. Back of these attempts the motive seems generally to have been either literary or commercial, perhaps both. Their popularity may be accounted for by the astonishingly widespread desire for some "short cut" to the mastery of vast and difficult fields of knowledge. Everything must be made quick and easy; intellectual sweat is frowned upon. "Mr. Wells puts the history of the universe into a thousand passionate pages. Mr. Van Loon reduces even this to the level of a child of ten. The outline of all science is available in four volumes; the outline of all art in four more; and the outline of literature is still another set. Philosophy has become a 'story'; the religions of the world, another; and latterly there has appeared the outline of all man's knowledge—in a single book!"

Furthermore, it is a perfectly human trait to enjoy the spectacle of rebellion against "authority." Youth especially is greatly intrigued by the discovery that something can be said on the other side of almost every proposition. "Think for yourself" is the slogan of the times. And, properly defined, a good slogan it is; but in their vast enthusiasm for the new intellectual freedom some have misconceived its meaning. Thinking for oneself does not mean a liberty to cut loose from facts, for there is after all one authority to which all men must bow at the last—the authority of facts. We may ignore them temporarily, but we do so at our own peril. The wages of this sin is intellectual death.

Christianity has suffered from this tendency, not only among the superficial and unlearned, but also at the hands of those who are acknowledged scholars in

various fields. For example, there is the treatment of Rousseau's religion by the distinguished P. M. Masson, who rightly points out that his religion knew nothing about redemption or repentance or a sense of sin, and then goes on to speak of the "profound Christianity" of the noted Frenchman. This of course is worse than confusion, and all the more inexcusable by reason of the writer's scholarship. In the blunders of the unlearned there may be a touch of the amusing. A vociferous automobile salesman recently in my hearing referred to a certain preacher as "a real Christian," and offered as proof the rather curious facts that the minister in question enjoyed a good prize fight and did not resent a masculine oath. But when the learned ignore the facts which are available to all sincere investigators it is difficult to be tolerant.

Christianity is based upon facts, and these facts are verifiable by intellectual investigation and personal religious experience. We know that the Son of God is come. And we know that He was manifested to take away our sins. For eighteen centuries men have been coming to Him by faith, and in Him they have found relief for the guilty conscience, peace that passeth all understanding, the life which is more abundant, and courage to work for righteousness in a world which is lost in sin. The historical and experiential facts of Christianity are not closed books; they are open to all who care to read. True, it requires some time and labor to investigate and personally verify these facts; but that is true about any important body of facts.

Nothing could be more absurd and unscientific than to attempt a definition of Christianity without first mastering its facts. Let the reader imagine, if possible, a freshman entering the chemistry lecture room of some

college for the first time. He has heard of chemistry and has decided that he will become a chemist. He inspects the rather lengthy and difficult list of elements; some of them have an air of familiarity—he knows what tin is—but others do not look inviting. Before leaving the room he informs the professor that he has decided to become a chemist, but he wishes to be an original thinker in this field, and in his opinion the chart of elements is much too long and complicated. Besides, it is conventional; therefore he will make his own chart. Doubtless the colleges have had some remarkable freshmen in their class rooms at various times, but it is pretty certain that no such freshman as I have described ever entered the doors of any institution of higher learning. Yet we have met college graduates whose conceptions of Christianity had been formed by somewhat the same process used by this hypothetical freshman of mine. With a lofty disregard for the vitally related body of Christian facts they have manufactured their religion by picking and choosing. The employment of this method has resulted in what might be called the “great Jesus-myth” of certain forms of popular modern religion—a Christ who bears little or no resemblance to the Christ of history and experience who is the Christ of God.

Finally, there is *the bias which often accompanies narrow and specialized views of life*. With the general idea of specialization there can be no quarrel, for in such a world as ours it would be hard to get along without the specialists. But there is a peculiar peril which attends all specialization. The specialist abstracts a small portion of human life from the whole and concentrates his attention upon it until he is in danger of forgetting how vast the whole enterprise of life really is. Christianity in the hands of such a man often fares badly.

Never having learned to speak its universal language, men are making Christianity over in the image of their own narrow specialties. Fixing upon such aspects of it as they are able to use in their own restricted areas, they either pass over the rest in silence or else deny its validity. The result is a whole brood of inadequate accounts—sociological Christianity, biological Christianity, psychological Christianity, one hundred per cent. American Christianity; there is no end to them.

Christian education—and by this I mean education under Christian influence and control—is suffering from this bias of specialization to a marked degree. Too often the schoolmen, shut up to restricted areas of life, have taken out of Christianity what they themselves would use, ignoring the rest as if their own peculiar interests exhausted the possibilities of human life. For a long period the special emphasis was upon the doctrinal side. More recently the emphasis has shifted to the ethical side; nothing matters, we are told, except right relationships with our fellow men.

This narrowing of the Christian element in education to a mere ethical influence indicates an illiberal view of life. One might easily suppose, judging from some versions of Christianity current in educational circles, that life is wholly a kind of glorified college career from which the novitiate goes forth joyously to slay political and economic dragons, with the issue always successful. Certainly the destruction of such monsters is important business; but this is not the whole of life as men actually find it. Life includes a great deal of weakness, many failures and mistakes, irreparable losses, and an astonishing amount of "inconvenient pain." Even the prophets of modern philosophy can see this much. "Nothing could be more ironical," writes Professor

Dewey, "than that those philosophers who professed universality have so often been one-sided specialists ignoring ignorance, error, folly. . . ." And in another passage he adds "death" to the long list of man's experiences which have been ignored by the system-makers.

As young men we go to college and listen hopefully to the professors as they outline their plans for changing the course of a refractory world. Beautiful plans they are, and interesting. But suppose they fail! Who then will gather up the fragments? Who will bring us undaunted and unafraid through the darkness of failure and catastrophe? It may be heretical to suggest the mere possibility of failure. Perhaps we shall be accounted selfish in wishing to save our own souls. But this desire for a soft place to land in case of failure is not altogether selfish. It is only taking into account real possibilities—call it foresight. The world is still a precarious place, not entirely safe for those with the best laid plans.

Now the function of all true education should be to prepare us for the business of life, and the priceless merit of an educative process which is completely Christian is that it prepares us for the whole of life—life as it really is, with all its complex and varied possibilities. For such a task no so-called "simplified Christianity" is sufficient; it has been weighed and found wanting. We should have learned this lesson long ago. But if the reader is not convinced, let him scan carefully the record of our Lord's earthly life among men. He will find there the "ethics of Jesus," the popular but little understood "Jesus' Way of Life," and the "religion of Jesus." He will find there *all* of Christianity—except the cross and its splendid sequel. Yet in the hour of crisis this "primitive Christianity" broke down utterly and failed, just because it failed to meet the deepest

needs of man who is a sinner. Christianity as a vital, spiritual, energizing, irresistible moral force began at the Place of the Skull and the open grave.

We should be profoundly grateful that men are coming at last to regard more seriously the ethical message of the Son of God; but we dare not forget that the Teacher of this message also said, "Without *me* ye can do nothing," and again, "The *truth* shall make you free." If we neglect these words it will be to our own destruction. Of course, for those who need only to know the right in order infallibly to do it, for those who are the captains of their souls, this word will have no meaning. The righteous need no Saviour. But most of us need help as well as information, strength as well as guidance, inspiration as well as precept, and life as well as rules for living.

The acute difficulty with all these narrow definitions of Christianity is that they are based on narrow views of life. Men have forgotten how great life is; they have forgotten the word of the Lord. "The life is more than meat." There are depths of truth here we have never sounded. Life is more than any part of it, more than anything which contributes to it, more than any philosophy which seeks to explain it, more than any sociological scheme to improve it. This is the mind of Christ. Men have spoken of Him as the great *Idealist* of the ages; and so He was. But He is also the great *Realist*, for He alone was able to look steadily at life and see it as a whole, as it really is, with all its aspirations, joys, and successes, all its weaknesses, failures, losses, pains, and unsatisfied longings. And He saw life, not as some far off god might curiously regard the struggles of humanity, but as a loving Saviour who took upon Himself our flesh and blood, becoming an actual participant

in the dust and turmoil of human existence. He alone knows the whole of life—its height, its depth, its breadth.

Now, Christianity properly conceived, Christianity as taught by our Lord and His chosen disciples, deals with all of life—life as it really is. "I am come," He says, "that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." There is no human problem, no human experience, no permanent human interest, for which Christianity does not have some solution to offer, some contribution to make, or some word to speak.

Consider *man's passion for concreteness*. Certain philosophers may be satisfied with the pallid faith of speculative idealism; but this, I think, is an acquired taste. The heart of man yearns for concreteness in his religion, his ethics, and his ideals. Even Kant admitted as much while declaring that "what ought to be could never be deduced from what is." But Christianity proves that Kant was wrong. For all that "ought to be" in the religious life, in morality and ideals—all that ought to be at last *is*, revealed in a concrete Person who was here in human life historically, who now lives in the hearts of His followers, and who will once again break into the stream of human history. Or take *man's yearning for fellowship with God*. Some may indeed, like Clifford, feel "with utter loneliness that the great Companion is dead," but the Christian knows better. For this is precisely the point where Christianity most completely demonstrates its claim to be the only Way. To borrow the words of the late President E. Y. Mullins, "Call Buddha and Buddha does not come. Call Mohammed and Mohammed does not come. But call Jesus and He comes." Or think of *man's silent protest against the incompleteness of human life* as it appears in our

present visible world. Nothing is finished—that is the difficulty. Now Christianity points the way to a richer, more abundant life here and now. But it does more; it holds out the prospect of an age to come when the crooked shall be made straight and that which is lacking shall be made complete.

But let us come to the crux of the matter: consider *man's unutterable longings in the face of death*. And I have no apology for mentioning this subject, for death is one of the facts of human experience, and it is nothing but sentimentalism to ignore it. "In the great literature of the world, Death figures as the last sombre enigma, before which man halts in dumb anguish or proud defiance, resenting its approach as that of a cruel and unnatural intruder, even when it closes a long and happy life." Contemplated at this angle, death becomes "the focus of tragedy, the one incalculable woe, a reality so towering that shelter from it can be found in neither words nor silence." And yet we find that from time immemorial men have tried to find shelter in both words and silence. Several years ago I ran across a pathetic bit of verse from the pen of an American poet; its tragic rhythm reveals one man's protest against the "last enemy":

Let me live out my years in heat of blood,
Let me die drunken with the dreamer's wine,
Let me not see this soul-house built of mud
Go toppling to the dusk—a vacant shrine!

Let me go quickly, like a candle light
Snuffed out just at the heyday of its glow,
Give me high noon—and let it then be night!
Thus would I go.

And grant that when I face the grisly thing,
My song may trumpet down the grey Perhaps;
Let me be as the tune-swept fiddle-string
That feels the Master melody—and snaps!

Christianity offers shelter from this "last sombre enigma," not in silence, neither merely in words, but in a Person and a fact—the Son of God and His resurrection from the dead. No religion can permanently succeed, no definition or interpretation of Christianity can be true, which ignores or fails to satisfy the great needs and longings of human life. To diminish Christianity is to set limits upon human life and despoil its richest possibilities. All exclusively "humanistic" tendencies become at last inhuman. But there is a true humanism, centered in Him who is both Son of Man and Son of God. "In him ye are made full."

ASHLAND, OHIO.

NEW IDEAS AND METHODS OF STUDY IN THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

By PROFESSOR A. T. ROBERTSON, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

NEW IDEAS and methods of study in the Greek New Testament are not wholly new; but life is change, and new turns are continually coming to old subjects. So I take the subject as the Editor has phrased it.

THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT AND THE RENAISSANCE

It is not putting it too strongly to say, as has been often said, that Europe awoke from the Dark Ages with the Greek New Testament in her hand. The Complutensian Edition of the Greek New Testament of Cardinal Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros was printed in 1514, though not circulated till 1522. Erasmus produced his edition in 1516 and so won in the race with Cisneros, though at the cost of accuracy in many ways and only by the hurried use of a few late minuscules, and thus laid the foundation for the *Textus Receptus* which held the field till the critical text of Westcott and Hort, in 1881.

It was the Greek New Testament that rejuvenated the world then, and it has the same power today for all who will take advantage of its dynamic power. In his Preface to his edition of the Greek New Testament Erasmus wrote: "These holy pages will summon up the living image of His mind. They will give you Christ Himself, talking, healing, dying, rising, the whole Christ in a word: They will give Him to you in an intimacy so close that He would be less visible to you

if He stood before your eyes." Melanchthon did his share also in interpreting the Greek New Testament to the old world that was opening its eyes to the new light in Christ.

THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT ITSELF

The difficulty has always been to get men to read the Greek New Testament itself, and not merely books about it. It is possible to be "grammar mad," and Browning in *A Grammarian's Funeral* pictured the common notion about the linguist:

He settled *Hoti's* business—let it be!—
 Properly based *oun*—
 Gave us the doctrine of the enclitic *De*,
 Dead from the waist down.

There are still preachers who neglect the Greek New Testament after leaving the theological seminary and who even boast of their neglect in the interest of the busy cares of the ministry. Some theological seminaries now grant the degree of Bachelor of Divinity without a knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew. One recalls the gruff protest of Thomas Carlyle: "What! your priests not know their sacred books!" The Greek New Testament will not only add new wrinkles to the brain, but will speak to the reader as nothing else can do. It is a new experience for each mind to unlock the door himself to this treasure house of the ages. Dr. A. M. Fairbairn has said: "No man can be a theologian who is not a philologist. He who is no grammarian is no divine." One may resent that crisp comment, but it is better to face it squarely for oneself. Melanchthon has said: "Omnis bonus theologus et fidelis interpres doctrinae coelestis necessarie esse debet primum grammaticus, deinde dialecticus, denique testis." The order

of Melanchthon is to be observed. It is not possible to omit the grammar without loss both as dialectician and witness. It is the grammar that makes many shrink back, the grammar and the vocabulary.

But it is not the herculean task that it is often represented to be. The example of John Brown of Haddington in the eighteenth century ought to shame many a preacher who has neglected his Greek New Testament. He was a shepherd boy in the hills of Scotland who wanted to preach. He had picked up a little Latin and wanted to read the Greek New Testament. He borrowed a copy occasionally from a minister near by, but he had no teacher, no grammar, and no lexicon. So without any help he learned the Greek alphabet from the proper names in the first chapter of Matthew by the help of the English and the Latin. Slowly he learned some words and some grammar. One day in St. Andrews he so astonished a professor in the University by reading a portion of John's Gospel that he gave him a copy of the Greek New Testament. In time he overcame prejudice and became the foremost scholar of his day, and his Bible dictionary has been used all over the world.

No such necessity confronts one today. The Greek New Testament has been opened up by new discoveries and new methods of study till now no one has any excuse for ignorance of this greatest of all books. The Greek New Testament is much closer to modern men than the literary Attic Greek of the days of Plato.

WHAT THE PAPYRI TELL US

Scholars used to make a jig-saw puzzle out of the Greek New Testament. The Hebraists called it a special language of the Holy Ghost, unlike anything

before or since, a sort of Hebraized Greek, with numerous forms and meanings in the words found nowhere else. Anything that was not familiar was called a Hebraism, and any doctrine could be justified by the convenient scheme of using one preposition "for" another, one case "for" another, one tense "for" another. That method satisfied the minds without historical and scientific insight. On the other hand, the purists insisted that the Greek New Testament was in pure literary Attic as a matter of necessity, since literary Attic was the crown of the Greek language. This was deciding the character of the Greek New Testament by logic and not by the facts. Winer in his historic *Grammar* had made an effort to get away from both of these wrong methods of approach, but he did not wholly succeed.

It was not till Deissmann, in 1895, published his *Bibelstudien* (*Neue Bibelstudien* in 1897, both translated as *Bible Studies* in 1901) that the truth became manifest. Deissmann says that the Greek of the papyri from Egypt, thanks to the discoveries of Flinders-Petrie, Grenfell, and Hunt, was in reality the identical language of the Greek New Testament with only occasional variations. James Hope Moulton and other scholars took up the matter and supported this view, till now it is a commonplace. The proof is abundant in Deissmann's *Light from the Ancient East*, Moulton's *Prolegomena*, the Moulton-Howard *Grammar*, my own large *Grammar*, the Robertson-Davis *New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament* (1931), the Blass-Debrunner *Grammatik*. The scraps of papyri found in the rubbish heaps and on the mummies give us the actual language of life in Egypt from three hundred B.C. to six hundred A.D. One finds business documents,

love letters, marriage contracts—anything, everything—written on the pieces of papyri in use then. They were thrown into the wastebasket and then on the trash pile where the dry sand quickly covered them. It is like a resurrection from the dead to have these scraps of papyrus speaking to us now.

So it is now plain that the New Testament writers employed simply the current Greek of the time in which they lived. There was no posing for effect or affectation of literary Attic like the modern school boy's Greek exercises. It is good still to know the literary Attic of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Plato, and Xenophon, but by no means necessary. One can dip right into the *Koiné* and learn the Greek New Testament in its own environment and atmosphere. It is a worthy tongue, and one that was the world speech for the Roman Empire. There is thus new dignity and fresh interest in the Greek of the New Testament.

THE LINGUISTIC REVOLUTION

It was all of this when Sir William Jones, about 1786, discovered the Sanskrit and showed its relation to Greek and Latin as an elder sister. This discovery led to the modern science of language with the outline of the whole Indo-Germanic family of languages to which Greek belongs. Comparative philology has thus lifted grammar from the bondage of a set of rules made to order by the grammarian, to a scientific historical method, the steps of which can be traced in the various kindred tongues. The study of the Greek New Testament is in this way linked with the growth of language through the ages, and the Greek of the New Testament is shown to be a noble vehicle for the new revelation in Christ. One can see this story best in Brugmann-Thumb's *Griechische Grammatik*.

NEW LEXICAL AIDS

The first interest of Deissmann was on the lexical side, and that has continued the main emphasis in his work. There used to be listed, as in Thayer's *Lexicon*, a large number of purely Biblical or New Testament words, but the papyri have already thrown light on all of them, save about fifty, and may throw light on most of these any day. Professor W. Hersey Davis, Th.D., of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, had already listed several thousand words in the papyri not in any Greek lexicon before Preisigke's *Fachwörter* etc. (1915) and his *Wörterbuch der Griechischen Papyrus-Urkunden* (1925-29) appeared. Preuschen-Bauer's *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (1928) gives much of the new knowledge, as does Abbott-Smith's *A Manual Lexicon of the New Testament* (1923, second edition) and also Souter's *A Pocket Lexicon to the Greek New Testament* (1916).

The chief contribution to the lexical knowledge from the papyri is to be found in the *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* by Moulton and Milligan. This work has been completed by Dr. George Milligan, since the death of James Hope Moulton, in Part VIII (1929). It is not a lexicon of the Greek New Testament, but is an invaluable repository of information bearing on the words of the Greek New Testament as shown by the papyri and inscriptions. The work is technical and expensive, but is worth having for anyone able to buy it and willing to use it. It will richly repay him.

There has been hope that Deissmann would round out his work by producing a lexicon of the Greek New Testament with the use of the vast material now avail-

able. The Great War, explorations in Ephesus, and other work have deferred that hope, till now it is not so bright. But there are, as already shown, new aids on the lexical side, in addition to the great printed editions of the papyri and inscriptions, which are available for the use of students, as here in Louisville. It is a fascinating field for research.

GRAMMATICAL HELPS

It is no longer necessary to bother with the wrangles of the Hebraists and the purists. Both Buttmann and Winer are out of date on account of the papyri and the comparative philology. The Blass-Debrunner *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (fünfte Aufl., 1921) has brought the old Blass *Grammar* up to date, though it is only in the German. Moulton's *Prolegomena* (1906) was the first attempt—and a brilliant one—to apply the discovery of Deissmann and the new knowledge from comparative philology to the forms and syntax of the Greek New Testament. A third edition appeared in 1908, and a translation into German in 1911 by Dieterich, *Einleitung in die Sprache des Neuens Testaments*. After Moulton's untimely death his proposed *Grammar* in three volumes (the *Prolegomena* being Vol. I) has been carried on by Professor W. F. Howard, Vol. II, *Accidence and Word-Formation* appearing in 1929. In 1908 A. T. Robertson's *Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament* appeared, which is now (1930) in the eighth edition and in four translations (Italian by Bonaccorsi in 1910, French by Montet in 1911, German by Stocks in 1911, Dutch by Grosheide in 1912). In 1931 there will be *A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament* by Robertson and Davis. In 1911 L. Radermacher pro-

duced his *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*, which had a second edition in 1925. In 1914 A. T. Robertson produced *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* which will soon (1931) reach the fifth edition (1540 pages). In 1927 Dana and Mantey brought out *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament* along the lines of Moulton and Robertson.

Thus it will be seen that there is ample provision made for the student to carry on with the new learning associated with the Greek New Testament. If one wishes to go further afield into the *Koiné* and the papyri there is abundant help like Mayser's *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri* (*Laut-und Wortlehre*, 1906; *Satzlehre*, 1926), Thumb's *Die Griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus* (1901), etc. For one who knows no Greek at all W. H. Davis has made *A Beginner's Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (1924, 4th edition 1928), so that it is now possible for one to begin *de novo* the study of the Greek New Testament in the light of the papyri and the comparative philology. There is no longer any excuse for any intelligent man to remain ignorant of the Greek of the New Testament in the light of modern discovery.

CRITICAL COMMENTARIES

The last time that I saw Dr. Alexander Maclaren (in 1905) he lamented to me that much of the fine work of Ellicott, Lightfoot, and Westcott would be undone by the new linguistic knowledge from the papyri and the comparative philology. That is true in so far as their interpretations rested on mistaken notions of grammar, as was sometimes the case. But these scholars would

have been the very first to take advantage of the new knowledge and to make their exegesis conform to the new grammar when shown to be true. In fact, Lightfoot himself in 1863 said this: "I will go further and say that if we could only recover letters that ordinary people wrote to each other without being literary, we should have the greatest possible help for the understanding of the language of the New Testament generally." It is not difficult to guess what Lightfoot would have said of the position of Deissmann about the papyri and the Greek New Testament.

This does not mean that the work of these great commentators is worthless. By no means. But it does mean that men who write commentaries now on the Greek New Testament without an adequate knowledge of the new linguistic learning by reason of the papyri discoveries and the comparative philology are out of date before the books are published. It is a waste of money and time to purchase such books when one can with the right grammars and lexicons and a critical edition of the Greek New Testament like that of Westcott and Hort or Nestle make his own interpretation in the full light of the new knowledge. A few such up-to-date commentaries have already come. But it is just as well to say once for all that the careful study of the Greek New Testament with the patient use of lexicon and grammar is better than the blind use of a commentary without the use of lexicon and grammar. It may be worth while to add that my series entitled *Word Pictures in the New Testament* is designed to lead men who know no Greek at all or very little (of whom there are so many) to take hold of the Greek New Testament itself and to learn it. It is not intended for expert

scholars or meant to take the place of technical commentaries which are needed. There is a fascination in the study of words in the New Testament, as is shown by Trench's *Synonyms* and Vincent's *Word Studies in the New Testament*.

TRANSLATIONS OF THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

They are necessary, for so many people do not know and never will know the Greek New Testament, which is the real New Testament. Fortunately the New Testament was written in the *Koiné* Greek, for it was the language of the Graeco-Roman world. By that very fact the mass of mankind could understand it in the first century. Portions of it like the *Logia* of Jesus (Papias about Matthew) were first in Aramaic. Outlying regions of the Empire, as the Gospel spread in the second and third centuries, would call for translations into their special tongues, like the Syriac tongue in the East, the Thebaic and the Bohairic in Egypt, the Latin in North Africa. As the Gospel message spread new translations appeared here and there in the world. In the West the Vulgate Latin translation made by Jerome finally became supreme. When the Greek New Testament of Erasmus appeared, in 1516, it had to compete with the Latin Vulgate which some ignorant priests termed the original Latin. When the King James English version was made, in 1611, the influence of Jerome's Vulgate was quite apparent. Several English translations had appeared, all resting on that made by Tyndale who paid the penalty for his hardihood with his life.

There is no need nor is there space to trace the long line of efforts to improve the translation of the English

New Testament. Several chapters are devoted to it in my *Studies in the Text of the New Testament*. These efforts have been made by groups and by individuals. The chief contenders for a place beside the Authorized, or King James, Version have been the Canterbury Version of 1881 and the American Standard Bible of 1901. There is now a committee at work for a still further revision of the American Standard Bible, which is not to make its final report before 1935. Each of the individual translations has merits of its own. But, good as they are, it is clear that no one of them will succeed in taking the place in church worship occupied by the King James, the Canterbury or the American Standard Version.

It ought to be said in conclusion that no one translation nor all of them together can reproduce all that is in the Greek New Testament. There are nuances in particles, turns in prepositions, delicate shades in the Greek tenses, the voices, the modes, the cases, that defy exact rendering into English. There is, besides, the subtle flavor of the linguistic atmosphere that vanishes at the touch of the translator. This does not mean that translations are of no value. Far from it. They are of very great value. They are all the New Testament that most people will ever have. But one should distinctly understand that he does not get quite all when he has only a translation. He has only the idea of one man or of a group of men concerning the meaning of the Greek. That is to say, he has to take it at second hand from someone else. There is no escape from this fact.

The only way to have first hand knowledge of the Greek New Testament, the real New Testament, is to

know the Greek text itself well enough so that it may speak to one as it does through no one else in the world. There are people who read only in the Greek New Testament, do it every day, do it from the love of it, do it year in and year out, do it till the dear Greek words talk to them by day and by night, do it till they carry them in their minds and their hearts.

LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY.

DO WE REALLY TRY TO UNDERSTAND?

By HERBERT W. MAGOUN, PH.D.

THE "ANANIAS CLUB" had a curious but decidedly commonplace beginning. It is usually attributed to a misunderstanding; but that fails to cover the ground. It was more than a mere misunderstanding; for a positive misinterpretation of what was said followed the misunderstanding, and the speaker was made to say not only what he did not say but also what he never would have said under any circumstances. The coining of the phrase was a natural result.

The hearer was at fault. He did not try to understand. Instead of doing so, he seized upon the words used, made them mean what he wanted them to mean, and then claimed that their author supported his views. It was only fitting that such a club should be organized for his benefit, and for the benefit of many others who do the same sort of thing to the detriment of honorable men.

What the possibilities are in this connection may be illustrated by a simple incident supposed to have occurred in the city of Boston. Two men met on a street corner. One, somewhat carelessly, used the word "faith." The other at once took him up. For an hour or more they argued and could not agree. Then one, looking at his watch, remarked, "I must go or I shall miss my train; but I will tell you—get such and such a tract and read it; it expresses my ideas exactly." The other gasped and exclaimed: "Why! I wrote that

tract myself." Neither had defined his terms, and neither had tried to understand the other.

That is one side of the picture, patent to all, but it is not the only side. There is, in fact, a more important side that few ever think of. In the words of Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, for many years head of the Greek Department at the Johns Hopkins University, it is: "Pin your faith to nobody, least of all to yourself; verify everything." He used to say it in a way never to be forgotten, and its wisdom can hardly be improved upon. Forty years of endeavoring to obey this behest have convinced me of that, although, incidentally, they have destroyed my faith in authorities, since, with hardly an exception, their opinions and theories have gone to pieces when submitted to the test of a searching analysis on the above basis. Let me illustrate with a simple and almost universally understood item from our classical grammars.

High school boys and girls for many generations have been taught that the classics have three quantitative values, called "long, short and common." Does that agree with native authorities? It does not. A "common quantity" that is "either long or short" is unknown to them. Without exception in either Greek or Latin, the teaching is that "ordinary syllables" are "neither long nor short" but are intermediate between the other two, and one grammarian actually calls them "means." Moreover, three of the authorities recognize clearly the inadequacy and inaccuracy of the rules for quantity—they are really compromises based on averages. The musicians teach that there are four quantitative values, and the net result of all the teachings is a combination of values equivalent to a sixteenth-note, an eighth-note, a dotted eighth, a quarter, a dotted quarter,

and a half-note, although the latter is utterly unknown to the metricians. The musicians insist on it, and they are right.

Another illustration came to light in a standard classical dictionary under the heading, *Domus*, where it was remarked that the Romans sometimes had trees in the vestibules of their houses. The authority cited was Vergil (*Georgics* IV.20) who says, among other things:

Palmaque vestibulum aut ingens cleaster inumbret.

This looks reasonable enough, until you discover that he is talking, not of a house but of a beehive, *alvearium* (*loc. cit.* 34). The meaning therefore is that a beehive should be so placed that its entrance lies in the shade. Did the writer of the article endeavor with due care to understand Vergil?

Perhaps there is no extant Greek quite so hard to read as the fragments of the *Harmony*, or *Theory of Music*, written by Aristoxenus. Less difficult but by no means easy is the treatise of Aristides Quintilianus, *On Music*, which deals also with meter and rhythm. Both have furnished rich material for blunders in the Greek lexicon. Thus the word *λείμμα*, plainly defined as "a least vacant time," which can only mean a pause equivalent to an eighth-rest, was exploited, with a reference to this very passage, as a *diesis*. But a *diesis* is a fragmentary tone in music, usually a quarter-tone or half a sharp. The word means, literally, a "remnant." In other words, it is the time left vacant between spoken words uttered so as to indicate their meaning. With it is placed *πρόσθεσις*, literally "an addition," which is defined as "a vacant time double the least one." That means a pause equalling a quarter-rest; but no notice was taken

of it in the lexicon. Did the lexicographers try to understand?

Curiously enough, this same passage furnishes a complete solution of the puzzling meters in Hephaestion's *Handbook on Meters and Rhythms*, although the unequal feet there found successfully defied metricians for about twenty centuries. Given these pauses and the rhythmical elements avowedly omitted from the metrical schemes, and there results a perfect equality of the bars; for bars and feet are two different things, as they plainly understood. In fact, if Hephaestion's schemes for complex meters were not composed of unequal feet, they would be wrong. Have the metricians tried to understand him, or have they simply taken something for granted and then proceeded to explain things on that basis?

The riddle was solved by finding out why the ancients said one thing about meter and another—sometimes a contradictory thing—about rhythm. Each of the statements was correct; for meter deals only with spoken syllables, precisely as they say it does, while rhythm is measured time, exactly as they state. We moderns have confused the two as they never did. We mix things, scanning for feet and *caesuras* too, while they separated the two things and never meant pauses by the word *caesuras*. That word referred to sections of a verse produced by a pause in the middle of a third or fourth foot, and the second of two always included the first. Why has no one discovered that fact? It is told plainly.

When Aristoxenus was discoursing on musical pitch and used the words, with reference to a particular string, *λιχανοειδὴς τόπος*, it was defined, with a reference to the passage, as "the place in the lyre, *where the fore-*

finger was used." It actually means "a pitch having the appearance of [suitable for] a second string"; for that string was named for the finger that was used in playing it. The second word never means "place" in his book. It is his word for musical pitch, and he begs his readers not to be critical of his terms, but to try to understand what is meant. Have all of them done so?

The Greek musical system was peculiar and complex, and modern authorities have been at fault in exploiting it along modern lines; for their basic scale was the tetrachord, not the octave, and their system covered two octaves and two whole-tones in its complete form, not two octaves (from A in the bass to A in the tenor) as now taught. Aristides gives thirteen scales for the earlier system, but fifteen for the completed one, each consisting of an "added" initial whole-tone and an octave. It was really two "added" tones and two tetrachords, the net result being seven whole-tones. The scales differed from one another by a half-tone in pitch primarily, so that the last "added" tone was fourteen half-tones from the start. Adding the last scale gives seven more whole-tones, or the fourteen mentioned. As the first "added" tone was avowedly the lowest they could sing, it must have been E in the bass, the highest being G-sharp in the tenor with modulation to A possible.

That this solution is correct is proved by the fact that it places their intervals with four subdivisions where we locate major tones, C—D and F—G, and those with three subdivisions where we have minor tones, D—E and G—A, although they also treated the interval A—B in the same way instead of recognizing it as a major tone. That is why their octave was a comma flat. At the beginning I did the obvious, like the rest.

It was decidedly wrong. Four or five years were spent in finding out the truth. Were they spent foolishly, or was I right in trying to understand? Are scholars as reliable as they should be in such matters?

Some students of the Bible, including prominent preachers, assume that the Bible teaches that the world was completed in six solar days of twenty-four hours each. The Hebrew word *yôm*, however, never had any such meaning. The Greek word for day never did either. In Greek a compound is used, equivalent to night-day, while in Hebrew *layil* must be added. Twenty-four hours was always a day and a night or a night and a day. There are no exceptions, although there may appear to be to the casual observer. 'John spent the next ten days perfecting his machine,' is not to be understood as meaning that he worked continuously all that time, and the Old Testament has parallel statements. Moreover, in sixty-two passages *yôm* or its plural is rendered "time," and there are at least two hundred and forty more where the same rendering would be appropriate. In five passages the word is translated "age" in the sense of a man's lifetime, and there is no other word in the Hebrew that could mean "age" in the sense of a geological epoch. Have the divines honestly tried to understand Moses here?

Some years ago one of them berated Moses for placing the sun and moon in the fourth day; but late development in astronomy and geology justifies Moses, since there was no climate and no sun domination in the world before the Carboniferous Age, and it further appears that the moon separated from the earth at about that time. If it did, we have an explanation of the inclination of the earth's axis to the plane of the ecliptic and a satisfactory cause for the development of the

seasons. This looks like a further chance to try to understand Moses.

"Firmament" should mean something solid; but his word means expanse. It is used (Gen. 1:6) of the cloud region and also (v. 14) of the blue vault beyond. Each is certainly an expanse, and neither is solid. Did Moses ever regard either as solid? Have we tried to grasp the ancient idea of such things? Do we stop to think that no one ever attempted to deal adequately with the idea of gravitation until Sir Isaac Newton made his famous deduction?

The ancients knew that rain came down from above and therefore inferred that water must be up there. How it managed to stay up there was no concern of theirs, and was not even thought of. They were mystics, not modern scientists. One of the *Rig-Veda* seers actually says things of Indra that would make him his own maternal and paternal grandfather and grandmother! Did that disturb the worshipers? Not in the least. It simply showed how great Indra was. Do we try to understand such things?

To the Hindus there were two sets of waters, one on the earth and one above it, and the same identical idea plainly prevailed among the early Hebrews. Read the first chapter of Genesis and see. No containing solid was ever dreamed of by Moses or any other Hebrew. There existed no incentive whatever for any such speculation. It was enough for them that the water came down from above in rain. There was water up there, and it was a separate division of water, different from that on the earth. Have we ever grasped the real significance of that explanation of things?

The ancient Aryans divided the sky into two regions, that of the clouds and the blue vault beyond. The

water above was usually placed in the cloud region, which they called "Father Sky" (*Dyāus pitā* in Sanskrit, *Zeûs πατήρ* in Greek, and *Ju-piter* in Latin, the last being really a vocative form in which the final *s* is lost). To the Hindu the blue vault become another god, the "Enveloper," and it may be inferred that he too had some connection with the waters, since he was supposed to punish sinners with dropsy.

As time goes on it becomes more and more evident that many things in heathen cosmogony and some things in heathen mythology are really reminiscences of a primitive original monotheism, long forgotten and abundantly perverted. In this fact we may find something suggestive. The Old Testament constantly uses what has been regarded as the plural for water. It is actually dual in form, precisely as the word for heavens is, one being *mayim* and the other *shāmayim*. Both are regarded as old plurals. Are they, in fact? Plural forms end in *îm* regularly, while both of these words end in *ayim*. The dual in Hebrew is ordinarily confined to things that go in pairs. Will that help us here?

The heavens are a pair, and the waters are also. The Aryans saw two heavens always bearing the same relationship to each other, and the Hebrews must have done the same. They also thought of two waters, or water divisions, and the Hebrews must have done so likewise. If the Hebrews used a dual while they did not, it merely shows that the Hebrews were more consistent than they were. What possible point could there be in using a plural in Hebrew under these conditions? The water in wells and streams was not only earth water but rain water too, because the rain fell everywhere. That is enough to explain why *mayim* is the regular Old Testament word for water. To my

own mind the plural is meaningless, while the dual is full of significance. It is a typical Oriental way of looking at things, and it instantly appealed to me when the Hebrew words were encountered. Have we understood this matter or tried to do so?

The picture presented to my youthful mind by the crossing of the Red Sea was a huge aquarium with people going through the middle of it and gazing at the fishes while the fishes gazed at them. The Hebrew, however, does not contain a word meaning "wall"; for the real content of the word is protection or a source of protection. That is what it actually was. Twice at the city of Geneva the Rhone has been blown dry, and what happened there also happened at the Red Sea. The ocean was higher then than it is now, as geological explorations have shown, and Lake Timsah and the Bitter Lakes were a part of the Gulf of Suez, as Kiepert's *Ancient Atlas* indicates. That produced a stretch of shallow water, narrow and some fifteen miles long just below Lake Timsah. It was blown dry, and the Israelites went across. A change of wind did the rest. Is the meaning of Moses fully understood here?

Tender-hearted people today are much disturbed over the death penalty and use the sixth commandment as a reason for its repeal. They forget that if they rightly interpret that commandment they do wrong in eating meat, swatting a fly, killing a mosquito, or destroying any other obnoxious life. Murder is all that is forbidden in the Hebrew. Do they understand or even apprehend what God's purpose was in giving that commandment to Moses?

On one occasion a young man came to me with considerable spirit and declared that he did not agree with Paul. "Why?" "Because he says that we ought to be

content with things as they are, while I think that we ought to try to make them better." "Well, let's see what Paul said." Young's *Concordance* soon furnished the needed word, and it appeared that Paul had said that he was "self-sufficient" in any state in which he found himself. He was equal to the occasion. That appealed to the young man, and he reversed his opinion. Was it unwise to try to understand Paul before saying anything about the matter?

A brief verse in Acts offers a remarkable instance of the need of trying to understand what is meant before translating. It is, "when this was noised abroad" (2:6. A. V.). This means, when the people heard a rumor of what had taken place at Pentecost. The revisions repudiate that translation and refer the verse to "the sound of a rushing mighty wind." Did they observe that the word used of the sound was related to the English word echo, while the word used here is related to the English word phonetics? It always means a sound made by lungs and a larynx, or one resembling it, so that it is a common word for language. It never refers to a noise. In the LXX (Gen. 45:16) it is rendered rumor, in effect, the actual word used being "fame," and that may explain how the translators came to take it in that sense here. The verb used really forbids either rendering; for it means to come into a state of being, to become, to take place.

What was it that had come into being, not having had a previous existence? The power to speak with tongues. It is therefore clear that the true meaning is, that when the apostles had received this gift of speech the people came together and were dumbfounded to hear themselves addressed each in his own dialect. That is what the Greek says: "Each one heard them speaking

in his own peculiar dialect." It does not say "tongue," or language, but dialect. This word means normally, conversation, way of talking, the language of a country, especially the dialect of a district. Here is more that needs to be understood.

What can it mean? All of those present must have spoken Greek, since that was the language of the Dispersion, very much as Yiddish is the language of the Jews today. Each one, however, would speak it according to the habits of the land he came from. That implies that the apostles had suddenly acquired the power to speak all the dialects of the strangers in Jerusalem. That would be like acquiring the power to talk in their own dialects to a Yorkshireman, a Scot, an Irishman, a Welshman, a Negro, a naturalized German or Italian or Frenchman or Swede, and so on, all of whom speak English with accents of their own. That would be no mean attainment, and, as the differences are all due to slight and subtle variations in the use of the tongue, it might well be called the power to speak with tongues. That is what it really is; for a change in the tongue is the thing that produces the peculiar accent of each class.

This question of dialect suggests something else. It has long been supposed that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew (Aramaic) and that it was later translated into Greek. What are the facts? The sole basis for the supposition is a quotation from Papias, in which he says (Eusebius: *Ecclesiastica Historia* III. 39) that "Matthew accordingly, in a Hebrew dialect, wrote out the oracular-sayings, and each interpreted them as he was able." Just above (24) Eusebius himself says that "Matthew, having first preached to Hebrews, when he was about to go also to others, having committed to writing in *the* tongue of his native land the Gospel

according to himself, . . . satisfied . . . them" (his countrymen). Observe that he says "preached to Hebrews," not "in Hebrew," as Cruse wrongly translated it, and that "*the* tongue of his native land" is necessarily contrasted with "a Hebrew dialect." Elsewhere (V. 8) we find a quotation from Irenaeus which says that "Matthew certainly, among the Hebrews, in their own peculiar dialect, produced a writing also of *the* Gospel."

Possibly your imagination is active enough to apply the saying of Papias to the Gospel of Matthew. Mine is not. I remember that "*the* tongue of his native land" (Palestine), with its mixed population and small Jewish minority, must have been Greek, and the words, "their own peculiar dialect," must refer to the same thing. Both of the church fathers wrote in Greek, and the dialect of Matthew's Gospel is a peculiar Greek and just such a dialect as Galilee must have used. Moreover, Josephus, a leader in Galilee, had to perfect himself in Greek before venturing to write his history. Have the theologians tried strenuously to understand Eusebius? Does he not make it clear that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Greek, precisely as it was to be expected that he would do?

We have a lot to learn about the Greek New Testament. How many of us realize that the verbs rendered "sit" nearly all mean either to squat or to recline on the left side? Masterpiece though it is, The Last Supper by Leonardo da Vinci is a rank anachronism, medieval in all its features. In the New Testament story, the context itself shows that the company was arranged in the usual way, reclining on a low bench or couch on three sides of a hollow square with a small table in the center on which was the common dish from which they

all dipped. Do we understand this situation? Have we tried to do so?

How many of us ever remember that when Judas went out not a single one of the apostles suspected that he was to be the guilty man? They all supposed that he had been sent on some errand. Why? Was he a villain in appearance or a typical "good fellow"? How did he happen to be the treasurer of the twelve? We know that he was. Was he a bad man or a weak one, a Shylock or a Tito Melema? And if he was really a handsome, weak-willed, self-indulgent, overconfident sort of man, is it hard to understand why he was so popular with the rest, or why he committed suicide when his little "business deal" worked, although he had expected it to fail when the test came? Have we tried to grasp the true situation in this case and understand what was involved?

Let us take another familiar thing and look at it. Anthropologists tell us that the Armenians have the race characteristics that should belong to the "lost" ten tribes; but the objection is raised that their language is an insuperable obstacle to any such belief, because it is an Aryan tongue. But—every Jew on earth outside of Palestine and China uses an Aryan tongue as his native speech and has done so for many generations. Has that fact turned him into a Gentile? Yiddish looks like Hebrew because it is written in Hebrew characters. It is a genderless German dialect, an Aryan tongue. And Judaeo-Espagnol is like it except that it is Spanish in essence. It is still Aryan.

According to the record the captive Jews were settled in the cities of the Medes. The Medes spoke a language akin to Persian and Sanskrit, both Aryan, and Armenian is said to be intermediate between Sanskrit

and Greek, but peculiar and different from other Aryan tongues. It is written in Greek characters. Under those conditions what sort of language would the lost ten tribes be likely to develop? How would it be likely to differ from Armenian? The Jews, captive in Babylon, forgot their own Hebrew and came back speaking Aramaic, and it all happened in the short space of seventy years. Does the linguistic argument hold?

Just now much is being said about the age of the earth. A few years ago much was said about the age of Niagara Falls. The first estimate, concerning the Falls, a pure guess, was thirty-five thousand years. Geologists then began to reckon on the known rate of erosion now. That led to an estimate of seven thousand years. It was promptly derided. Finally a government geologist said it was seven thousand or less. The less was right. Erosion varies directly as the amount of water going over a given point, and the present Falls could not be moved a single mile down stream without being contracted to such an extent that at least four times as much water would flow over a given spot on the brink as now goes over the edge. Did the geologists reckon on that feature? Not one of them. And yet it is the most important factor in the problem. Other factors enter in, because high water would involve escape by other channels; but, making all due allowances, the Falls cannot be over five or six thousand years old at the utmost, since the erosion involved could easily be caused in less than five thousand years with only half the present flow. That narrow gorge, where the rapids are, needs to be remembered and understood. These results were checked by the Mississippi gorge at Minneapolis, where similar conditions were noted, and the whole thing may be verified by consulting folios 190

and 201 of the United States Government Survey. Have the geologists understood, or tried to?

For some reason our modern scholars have developed peculiar facility in overlooking vital elements in their problems. What would the effect be if all of us tried to understand fully, to comprehend our fields, before we rushed into print? Would books be so transient as they are now? Would life lose its interest, because bickerings would cease? Is real progress possible unless we do try? Are we getting many "assured results" as a matter of fact? Often are they anything more than partisan claims?

In a world utterly devoid of machinery, with no printed documents whatever, with reading as well as writing a profession, when books are rare and so written that only an expert can read them—words run together, no capitals, no punctuation marks, inordinately long lines, no separation between sentences even, with hardly a tithe of our modern knowledge to feed restless brain cells and a boundless curiosity, and all life's conditions utterly different from ours—is it to be supposed that men did things as we do them? Would they know how? On the testimony of a cultured Syrian, Rev. Abraham M. Rihbany, D.D., the modern Syrian will not read a book if he can find a man to tell him what he wants to know. Would Luke be likely to consult Mark's compilation from Peter's sermons, when he was in Jerusalem for two years or more and could consult the living witnesses? Would unknown redactors, for whom there is not a shred of objective evidence, know how to produce what we moderns now recognize as "parasitic literature"? If not, what becomes of the "assured results"?

Scholarship has almost become a religion. With

some it really is a fetish. Is it worthy of any such exaltation in its present condition? Doctors still differ, and all of them may be wrong. They were all wrong about "rabbit fever." The German authorities who reconstructed a Greek lock from the description were all wrong too, although each was sure he was right. The spade settled the matter. May it not be well not to be oversure of our results? Our sons may destroy them, and their sons may repay them in kind, and then the next generation may continue the good work. Scientific books are proverbially short-lived. Other books die sooner or later. One and only one lives, and that is the Bible, which the critics would have us believe is just like all the rest. Is it?

BELMONT, MASSACHUSETTS.

SCIENCE AND DIVINE REVELATION

By W. BELL DAWSON, M.A., D.Sc., M.Inst.C.E., F.R.S.C.

THE ABOVE HEADING is intended to indicate an inquiry as to whether science is capable of covering the whole extent of human knowledge; or whether much that is vital for us to know, especially in regard to our relation to God, does not lie beyond the reach of human investigation, and cannot be known with any certainty unless God reveals it to us Himself. It may seem audacious for anyone to propose such a theme; but our present endeavor will be merely to point out that science has limitations in several directions, and to indicate matters of supreme importance to us that we cannot find out for ourselves.

In these days almost everything claims to be "science," from the profoundest researches of the physicist to the application of knowledge to what were formerly called the arts of life. The study of the mind and philosophic investigation make claim also to be included in science. In addition, many theories more or less unfounded are popularly classed as science. There is a real obstacle in the way of a correct understanding of things when the term "science" is made to embrace so much, for it implies that man is able to conquer all realms of knowledge and to apply that knowledge to fulfill all his wishes. For the popular mind is naturally impressed by the wonderful advances made in recent years in utilizing the forces of nature to serve our purposes and in the application of research to the control and cure of disease. Such accomplishments have unfor-

unately dazzled the imagination and made it difficult to discern values above the level of comfort and advantage. A boastful attitude has also been fostered by the glorification of human achievement, brought before us daily in the newspapers, which has led to a widespread feeling that we can now arrange the world to suit our own convenience and even ignore God.

Such views, however, are in no sense the outcome of reasonable science, but are to be attributed to a perverse attitude of the human mind and not to science itself. It would be equally unfair to discredit modern discoveries and inventions because they may possibly be used in destructive warfare, since the blame for this would not lie with the inventions themselves, but with the evil intents of men. The advance of science, to those who know what it really means, should lead to deeper humility and a more profound reverence for the Creator who has devised and originated the wonders which we merely explore. When Newton felt in his discoveries that he was only walking in the footsteps of the Creator, how much more should we now as new marvels continually open up before us which we cannot even explain.

If we look back some fifty years we will better appreciate this. We then thought that we had a fairly satisfactory explanation for almost everything; but the advance of knowledge, instead of bringing us within reach of a general understanding of all material things, has only opened up unexpected vistas which need explanation. In chemistry, for example, each element shows a distinct preference to combine with some kind of its fellow elements and not with others. Again, there are elements that hold aloof, unwilling to combine with anything else if they can help it. The materials of the world, as we find them, are due almost entirely to these

preferences of the atoms to combine with each other in the way that they do. But what is the reason for this? Any explanation now offered must be far more complex than what we were content to accept in the old days. As another example, our idea of light as a vibration has widened out into a great series, all the way from exceedingly minute X-rays to radio waves many meters in length. Some of these wave-lengths serve in photography, others in radio broadcasting; they convey heat or light, and so forth. What in reality is the reason for these various characteristics, if they are all vibrations?

Many other examples might be given of things that still await explanation, such as the remarkable properties of water in relation to what we now know about the two gases that compose it, or the vitally important question of how the light and heat of the sun are maintained. But the main point in the whole matter is that the further our knowledge advances, the less able we are to explain. The explanations of the past are being discarded as inadequate, but there is little to offer in their place. This limitation of science in regard to explanation is now so acutely realized that many scientists think it best to let it alone and be content to go on investigating till we know more. Yet do we really understand what we cannot explain in the material universe around us? Our conceptions of size have been extended extraordinarily in the present generation, regarding both the minute and the immense, from the particles composing an atom, to the equally unimaginable sizes and distances of enormous nebulae. Things that we now handle ordinarily are inconceivable enough. For example, radio waves of medium length, as they pass along, cause vibrations of a million per second; and it is because of this great rapidity, that they can outline so accurately

the much slower sound waves into which they are transmuted, and so reproduce even the tone or accent of the voice. But to imagine such rapidity is almost as much beyond us as to grasp the thousands of millions of years that astronomers speak of.

In thus touching upon the meaning of the advance of modern science we have kept to its more simple and foundational branches. Yet even in considering these we may well realize that it is our intelligence which has a limit, and that much may always remain beyond our comprehension. It may be salutary therefore to admit that the ways of the Creator are past finding out. "Lo, these are but the outskirts of his ways; and how small a whisper do we hear of him! But the thunder of his power who can understand?" (Job 26:14, R. V.)

The Methods of Science.—It may be said that there are three steps in the inquiries of the scientist: He uses methods of investigation to determine the facts of the case; he thus arrives at results which may be definite or only provisional; and on these he founds explanations and constructs theories to account for what has become known. It is therefore very necessary, in discussing science in any of its branches, to distinguish clearly between the facts and results that are definitely established, and the explanations and theories which are offered. It is also possible so to stress the importance of research as to maintain that everything in the universe comes within the domain of science; and there are many who imply by their attitude that they will accept no knowledge as reliable unless it is reached by scientific methods. We wish therefore to inquire whether this attitude is justifiable, and to consider whether there may not actually be wide realms of knowledge that concern humanity closely which are beyond the reach of scien-

tific method and research. In this way we will best be able to appreciate the true sphere of science and its limitations.

The methods of science are primarily measuring, weighing, and analyzing; the natural sciences, in dealing with plants and animals, begin by comparing and classifying. Yet would we say that all things which cannot be treated in these ways, can be waived as unreal? The most primary of the sciences, probably, is mathematics, which has to do with "measurable quantity," as we are informed at school. We ask, then, a mathematician to tell us what love is; and if he answers strictly from his own standpoint, he replies: 'Love is shapeless, it is neither square nor circular; it is not measurable, for what would be the meaning of a pound or a square foot of love? It is altogether intangible and illusory. The poets may dream of it; but to my comprehension it is not a reality.' Such a view is of course quite extreme, and could only be given by the narrowest of specialists. Yet the attitude that it exhibits may exemplify by its very crudity the reason that science is regarded as hostile to religion. For it brings out the unreasonableness of postulating that no knowledge is true or actual that cannot be arrived at by the methods and investigations of science. This may almost be compared with the argument that, because, in dissecting the human body and in making a chemical analysis of the brain, the soul cannot be found, therefore no spiritual element exists in man. Such reasoning might conclude that, since our relation to God cannot be discovered by the methods of science, it is not a "scientific reality"; and such things as faith and worship must be classed as imaginative or superstitious and should be left out of consideration as negligible.

When such views are thus carried to their logical limit it may serve to indicate that methods and reasonings which are found to be valid in a limited field cannot properly be applied to everything conceivable. Any scientist who maintains them really becomes an obstructionist, by placing obstacles in the way of rising to the higher conceptions to which the human heart and soul aspire. The rationalist makes an equally basic mistake when he claims that all that can be known of spiritual realities is what we can learn by our own experience. He wishes thus to take his stand beside science; but in doing so he evidently supposes that science has no limitations. For his aim is to comprehend religion through experimental investigation; and he accepts the Scriptures only so far as they depict experience, and would consider them to be merely what men of old were able to find out for themselves. It is evident that to restrict our knowledge of God and His attributes within these bounds is to place religion under the very limitations which handicap scientific inquiry. We might well be warned against such procedure when science itself tells us that the most serious limitation of all is the limit of our own intelligence. The Scriptures confirm this when they say: "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?"

The Theories of Science.—In addition to the methods used in research, to determine what things are and how they act under various conditions, science has its theories. A theory may be very allowable; indeed, in many cases, it would hardly be possible to carry on investigation without one. The scientist must suppose or imagine something, which he calls his "working hypothesis"; and he then proceeds to ascertain how far it holds good and whether it affords a satisfactory expla-

nation. But no reasonable scientist would dogmatize on his theory, but would only hold it provisionally.

As an example we may take the theory of light. It is recognized that light is most primary; and its leading place in the first chapter of Genesis, next to the creation of matter itself, may be taken as a guide-post to science. But what is light? There are two theories about it, one of which accords with its behavior while traveling along (the undulatory theory), and the other (the corpuscular theory) regards light as consisting of particles, or *quanta*, which explains its action when it strikes an object in illuminating it. In the investigation of crystal structure, which brings out much that is fundamental in molecular arrangements, light is the medium of investigation; and some working theory for its mode of action is necessary. Sir William Bragg, an eminent leader in this line of research, put the matter thus in his recent presidential address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science: On Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, we adopt the one hypothesis; on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, the other. We know that we cannot be seeing clearly and fully in either case, but are perfectly content to work and wait for the complete understanding. This illustrates the way that theories are used by working scientists, and the absence of any dogmatism regarding them. One of the most unsatisfactory things about the theory of evolution—from the purely scientific standpoint, apart from any question of evidence—is the positive assertion usually made, that it is “an established principle in science.” It was not thus that Darwin originally propounded it, for he continually used the expression, “Let us suppose”; and later discussion and investigation have brought out difficulties which confront his theory. The interpreta-

tion of facts to accord with a theory is evidently an unsound method, and this reveals once more that scientific theory cannot be put forward as an unfailing and final explanation.

Knowledge beyond Science.—In this discussion regarding the limitations of science we have referred more directly to those sciences which deal with material things; for these are the most foundational and in closest touch with primary matter and force, where we can best judge of the scope and the limit of the methods used in acquiring knowledge. And yet if we go forward into the realm of philosophic investigation we may discern similar limitations in the powers of the unaided human understanding. When man follows out his own ideas in trying to arrive at spiritual realities we find, as a matter of history, that this has led him in two divergent directions. He has imagined, on the one hand, a multiplicity of gods related to the various elements of nature, such as the weather and the seasons, as well as the arts of life and the domestic virtues; each has its supervisor or patron. On the other hand, there is the idea of pantheism, where nature itself is given divine attributes, and every stream or tree has an indwelling spirit which reflects the universal mind that nature as a whole embodies. Either of these views leads to superstition and degraded ideas of the divine nature, which result in degradation to man himself, as history also testifies. All this brings to light man's failure to reach the truth, even under the leadership of the most philosophic minds in pagan lands.

The great contrasting alternative is the view of the relation of God to nature which is presented in the Bible. For when it is understood that God is the Creator of all things, there remains no place for secondary deities;

and the great fact of His personality sets pantheism entirely aside by bringing out His personal relation to man. The Word of God warns us in the most unmistakable terms that those who attempt to reach spiritual realities by their own reasoning powers are prompted to do so by their vanity of mind, and will only succeed in darkening their understanding. (See Eph. 4:17-18; 1 Cor. 1:18-25.)

When we see the way that former theories in the various departments of science are being modified or discarded in our day we realize the uncertainty or provisional character of most tenets, as knowledge advances. Science can therefore only feel its way, while unable to arrive at complete and final truth, or an ultimate conclusion. It is perhaps only the specialist who can reach the final edge of all that is known in his particular subject, and look over into the dark. Those who have thus stood on the boundary line of what is known and gazed out upon the dimly seen vistas of our ignorance can best appreciate the limitations of knowledge. In stating what we mean by the ultimate, we must include broadly a knowledge of God, as well as the beginning or origin of all that we see around us, and what is to become of it all in the end. We wish especially to know our origin and our destiny. The ultimate, in these directions, is entirely out of the reach of research by science—and beyond attainment by human investigation. It can be made known to us only by revelation from Him who lived before the world was, who from age to age is God, and who sees the end from the beginning.

We find that there are scientists with a wide outlook and balanced judgment who are convinced of this in dealing with origins. We note this in an essay just

published, *Creation and Modern Cosmogony*, by Sir Ambrose Fleming, famous for his discoveries in electricity. He points out that man is enabled in some degree to comprehend the works of the Creator; but in regard to origins he says: "The scientific study alone of those works as they at present exist can never give us true information as to their origin." Sir William Dawson the geologist when questioned as to the origin of man replied, as a scientist: "I know nothing about the origin of man except what I am told in the Scripture—that God created him. I do not know anything more than that, and I do not know anybody who does. I would say with Lord Kelvin that there is nothing in science which reaches the origin of anything at all." Dr. W. Bateson the noted biologist states candidly: "The problem of the origin of life still stands outside of the range of scientific investigation."

In the other direction, the uncertainty of the modern mind in regard to the future of humanity, may best be seen from the contrasting views held. Some believe in the gradual improvement of the human race. Above the purely materialistic level of increase in comfort, they hope that, if everyone will do his best during his lifetime, in a few more generations his descendants may reap the benefit and ultimately some goal may be reached. There are others who take a frankly pessimistic view and depict the future of the race in the darkest colors, because the highest achievements of science and invention may be used for the mutual destruction of nations and result in the collapse of civilization and even the extinction of mankind. It is thus recognized that scientific research is unable to unveil the origin of man or his destiny. The challenge of the Lord to Job is still outstanding: "Where wast thou when I

laid the foundations of the earth? . . . Have the gates of death been opened unto thee? . . . Declare, if thou knowest it all."

The Highest Realities.—In considering the need for a revelation from God, if we are to know anything definite and certain regarding higher spiritual matters, we will take up only three leading questions: (1) The character of God and His attributes, in their bearing on His relation to humanity; (2) The promises of God as the ground of prayer to Him on our part; (3) The question of sin and forgiveness. It is beyond discussion that such themes and inquiries are quite above the domain of science, and out of the reach of scientific methods. And yet to us, as human beings, they are matters of supreme importance.

The Christian belief throughout the centuries has been that we cannot know about such things unless they are revealed to us by God Himself, and that we have this revelation in the Holy Scripture. Indeed, there is probably no one, who is not a thorough skeptic or an atheist, who will go as far as to assert that the Bible contains nothing in the way of revelation from God. If therefore we would know what man can find out for himself, we must look to nations or peoples who have no knowledge of the Scriptures. Even then care is required, for some glimmer of primary revelation may have come down the ages from the fathers of mankind who knew the truth and held intercourse with God.

1. The character of God has been the quest of all the pagan nations; seeking especially to know whether God is kindly or angry, well-disposed or vindictive, towards men. The various views and opinions reached serve to show how very uncertain any conclusion must be. Almost all primitive peoples believe in a Supreme

Being; and it is noteworthy that primitive races, such as the American Indians, have a more definite conception of this than that which existed in the more complex civilization of the Greeks and Romans. In their pantheon there was little of supremacy or precedence, as each god had his own domain. They had less idea of primacy among their gods than the Babylonians of an earlier age; and we note that when the Apostle Paul addressed the Athenians his first endeavor was to bring them back to the idea of one supreme God, as a basis for the Gospel message.

In some nations the people hold that the supreme God is sufficiently beneficent not to do them any harm, and their practical concern is with the numerous demons that are ever watchful against them, to injure their crops, bring illness on their children, and so forth. Worship and offerings are to propitiate and placate these demons, and charms and incantations are used to avert their evil designs. A distinctly different view is taken by the Pygmies of Central Africa, and it deserves consideration because they are a quick and intelligent race and have long lived in isolation in the forest. In the center of their villages they place a large hut as a temple to God, and their belief as stated by one of their leaders is this: "The great God made the trees and all the wonders of the forest; He made you and me. But God is cruel and strong and hates us, and can bring death and our enemies into our forest; and so we give Him food and offerings so that He may be kind to us." (From an interview with Pygmies by Archdeacon Lloyd, given in his book, *Apolo of the Pygmy Forest*.)

These diverse and conflicting ideas of the character of God may suffice as typical examples; for the various views that different peoples have reached, as well as the

vague conjectures of philosophers, show how impossible it is for man, unaided, to reach any definite conclusion. The revelation of God in the Scriptures makes it clear that a true knowledge of His character can come to us only by what He declares Himself and shows forth by His dealings with men. This is all the plainer since it stands contrasted in the Bible with the ideas of the Egyptians and Babylonians, so often referred to. For they were steeped in superstition, and in every difficulty they turned immediately to their magicians and soothsayers. The exalted ideal of the Almighty set before us in the Bible dispels completely the darkness of idolatry. The real danger, for those who read or expound the Scriptures, lies in forming one-sided conceptions of God by ignoring some of His attributes and emphasizing others. For, to bring before us a complete picture of the character of God, the revelation given in the Word of God is needed in its entirety.

There is a strong temptation to overlook the righteousness and justice of God and His judgments, for the call to the prophet is: "Prophesy not unto us right things; speak unto us smooth things." It may therefore be well to point out that the Lord Jesus Himself depicts the judgments of God in more forceful terms than any of the prophets before Him. What emphasis He lays on the close connection between sin and hell fire, and He depicts in His parables the final fate of the impenitent in appalling terms. If these are taken as figures of speech, they must at least represent terrible realities. (See Mark 9:43-48; Matt. 13:41-42, 50; Luke 16:23.) It is because of the absolute justice of God that the way of forgiveness which He has provided is so transcendently wonderful. It is only from the mouth of the Lord, therefore, that we can obtain a bal-

anced view of the character of God and the perfect circle of His attributes.

2. In our relation to God and in all worship there is perhaps nothing more outstanding than prayer. It would require a volume merely to review the aspects of the subject that have been discussed from multitudinous points of view. But our present purpose is to inquire whether man by his own intelligence can determine that praying to God is reasonable and justifiable, or whether we must accept the verdict which science is very generally supposed to give, that prayer is irrational and out of accord with the laws of nature.¹

There are others who lay emphasis upon the attitude of the mind in prayer, holding that it is beneficial to the soul since it brings calm and relief to the troubled heart. We are asked to let this suffice us, without disturbing ourselves by further questioning regarding an answer. If we take this to be all there is in prayer there is no need to seek any reality in it outside of ourselves. Pliny in his philosophy put forward in a very similar way the benefit to ourselves of a belief in God and in personal immortality, even if no ground for the belief could be demonstrated. Those therefore who are in ignorance of the true character of God and have no knowledge of any revelation from Him can only feel their way in the darkness of conjecture. They cannot know the true meaning of prayer in relation both to God and to ourselves. This is all too sorrowfully illustrated by the experience of the heathen who know not God. There is therefore but slight defense against the rationalistic arguments brought forward in the name of science and

¹ See discussion of this in the booklet, *Miracles and the Laws of Nature*, by the present writer. London: The Bible League.

philosophy, unless we know something of the attitude of the Lord Almighty Himself towards our prayer.

In contrast with these uncertainties from human reasoning we fall back upon the declaration of Scripture, as to the great reality on which prayer is based. This is the promise of God to hear and answer prayer, which is exemplified throughout the Bible and stands out in its clearest light in the teaching of Christ. If the fact of promise underlying prayer were kept in view this would answer of itself nearly all the objections against prayer and arguments on its futility. For "He is faithful that promised." On the other hand, it is quite clear regarding any promise, human or divine, that if we distrust it and do not believe it we can get no good by it, as is also pointed out in the Scriptures. (See Heb. 4:2.)

It would be strange if the relation of prayer to a promise were not understood. For nearly all our business transactions as well as domestic relations are built upon promises. Marriage is essentially a promise, and the money we handle would be worthless paper if it did not carry on its face a signed promise of payment in silver or gold. What then of a promise made by the Almighty Ruler of the universe? Yet the objection is often raised in the name of science, that an answer to our petitions would involve a suspension or reversal of the laws of nature, and these laws are fixed and unchangeable. But such a statement is quite fallacious in the domain of science itself. For we find in the case of both plants and animals, that higher laws can modify and even reverse lower laws. At a higher level again, human intelligence and will power can alter the mode of operation of many physical and mechanical laws, as we see every day in human activities.² Can we hold then,

² *Op. cit.*

that the great God is unable to mold the forces of nature in such a way as to meet the needs of His creatures? From the moral standpoint He would surely work a miracle if necessary rather than allow His promise to go by default.

When we turn to nations and peoples of the past or present who have no communication from the true God or any revelation of His promises, we can understand the way in which they regard prayer. In Greek and Roman literature there does not seem to be any indication that they thought their gods had made them a promise on which to base their petitions. The non-Christian peoples depend on offerings as bribes to their gods, or on self-torture to prove their earnestness and thus secure the gods' favor. When the prophets of Baal were under dire necessity to obtain an answer, to meet the challenge of Elijah, they called from morning even until noon, saying, "O Baal, hear us"; and when there was no voice nor any that answered they cried aloud and cut themselves with knives and lancets. For they had nothing to rely upon but their own perseverance and earnestness to persuade their god to hear. We find essentially the same viewpoint expounded in New Thought, which makes the answer to prayer dependent on forces within ourselves. It is thus put in a recent publication of that cult: "Prayer acts through an intense desire-force. It is desire thought that brings the answer; a psycho-kinetic force."

Endeavors on such lines, so commonly made by non-Christian peoples and so pathetic in their earnestness, show that it is not possible to arrive at any true understanding of prayer apart from revelation. This is needful in three ways: First, a revealed promise that God will hear us; then, a knowledge of the wishes of God for

us, that our prayer may be in line with His will; and last, that prayer can only be heard on high if it is offered in the Name of Christ, that the answer may be granted for His sake. For this is the promise of Christ to His followers: "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you"; and again: "If we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us."

Here then is one of the most important aspects of the Christian message to the non-Christian world, if we have any pity for the earnest endeavor of those whose prayer goes forth into the darkness. If their petition is for anything higher than mere material advantage, we may hope their cry may be heard; for the Lord Jesus is merciful and "has compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way." Yet the outstanding fact remains, that there is no definite promise that prayer will be answered which is not offered in the Name of Christ the Redeemer.

3. It is unnecessary to prove by elaborate discussion that man is sinful. Many attempts are made to explain away sin. Yet true philosophers recognize that man is beset with a sense of guilt. Even Freud in his latest work frankly admits "the eternal struggle between *want to* and *must not* in every human being; which produces those permanent feelings of dissatisfaction, of depression, of uneasy anxiety, which are always with us." He is impatient with man's "eternal feeling of guilt and of remorse," although in his philosophy he can find no remedy. (According to a review in *The Telegraph* by its Vienna correspondent.) In any wide outlook over the past and present we see much earnest endeavor in a multitude of ways to deal with the problem. The idea that the good deeds of our life will compensate for the evil will scarcely bear inspection. To

put it crudely, can we suppose that if we are exceptionally good one day, we may be bad the next, so this will balance out and leave us with a clean sheet? Even the pagans cannot thus satisfy their conscience, for we see them undergoing self-torture, making tedious pilgrimages in painful ways, or throwing a cherished infant into the sacred river, to acquire merit and virtue. The monk in the middle ages who tried to subdue the evil in his heart by scourgings and long vigils found this equally ineffectual. The most worthy of men throughout the ages, without light from the Word of God, have most acutely felt the need of an answer.

Yet there is a modern view that all this concern about sin and also the feeling of guilt are merely relics of past times and belong to an immature state in human thought, from which real enlightenment will emancipate us, and that the best way is to ignore and forget it all. Now, it is quite allowable to test such a view by examining it in the light of its outcome. It is clear, to begin with, that it can only be held consistently when combined with atheism, by denying the existence of God and repudiating all idea of human responsibility. We would find that this way of viewing sin, if universally accepted, would lead to the overthrow of all moral restraint, and would produce a world intolerable to live in.

In any such inquiry as this, the human heart can scarcely deceive itself so completely as to ignore the facts of the case. When we hear the plaintive appeal of the burdened heart to the heavens above and the earth around for some solution we must realize that neither science nor philosophy is capable of giving an answer. For it is manifest that it is not the conclusion reached by human reasoning that can count, but whether God is Himself satisfied, as He ultimately is our judge. He

only can inform us of the divine solution and the way of forgiveness. What way, then, has the Lord Himself devised and achieved by which sin may be removed as the cloud of obscurity between man and Himself, so that man may be reconciled to God? This is the theme which runs through the Bible, and to look into it even in briefest outline shows how far it transcends all that man could possibly arrive at by scientific research or philosophical reasoning. "For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."

The first result of sin was to bring into clear light the love of God and His concern for humanity, in that He would not abandon man, but undertook in His divine compassion to find a way whereby man could be brought back to Himself from the paths of disobedience and waywardness which he had chosen. It is thus that the glory of God shines through the darkness of sin. In making known His purpose to the mind and heart of men, the great lesson which the Lord found needful was to impress upon His people that without shedding of blood there is no remission. For the blood is the life, and it was set apart as sacred to be used only in sacrifice. The people of God were thus prepared throughout many generations for the Redeemer from sin when He should come, so that all who were willing might be led to understand and accept redemption through the sacrifice of the Saviour.

Here we may obtain some insight into the greatest problem in the moral universe, how God can be just and yet pardon sin, and how His own attributes of justice and mercy can be reconciled to each other. The saints of old were given some glimpse of this, for in speaking of forgiveness by the God of salvation, they say:

“Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other.” In the New Testament the marvel is more fully explained, how God can be just and yet the justifier of him who believes in Jesus. Can we wonder, in view of this triumph of God’s righteousness, that the song of the redeemed in Heaven is in praise of Him who loved them and washed them from their sins in His own blood. This teaching in regard to the forgiveness of sin is consistent throughout the Scriptures, from the days of Cain and Abel to the close. When it is the Way for mankind which the Lord and Judge reveals, as well as the wondrous means whereby His own attributes are brought into harmony in forgiving sin, it would surely be audacious for a human being to question or criticize. To those who may be in doubt, His promise is that the Holy Spirit will convince of sin and lead into the truth; and the gift of the Holy Spirit is promised unconditionally to those who ask. In view of these promises, they that seek with “an honest and good heart” will find the truth.

MONTREAL, CANADA.

EXEGETICAL

DIVINE WRATH AND HUMAN HISTORY

Romans 1:18-25

By ANDREW R. OSBORN

PAUL'S THEME is the Gospel of Christ as the only availing remedy for the sin and anguish of humanity. It is not the only remedy which is being offered, for philosophy occupies itself with the problem of human conduct and offers in its different schools of thought a way of life. This human wisdom strives to discover first principles, which will show the inner connection of the phenomena of the world and of human thought and conduct. Paul formulates no such first principles, but concerns himself with sin and guilt, and tells the story of One who came to live and die for humanity.

To the philosopher of that day this was as foolish as the crude explanations of the man in the street would appear now to the man of science. Yet it is worthy of note that the despised method of the Apostle is more in accord with our modern thinking than the philosophy of Platonic ideas, for he begins with the observable facts of life and points out laws manifested in them. (*Cf. Dewey: Reconstruction in Philosophy*, p. 21 ff.) Moreover, arguing after the manner of a twentieth century pragmatist, he shows that he has something which proves itself true by its working. Therefore, although to the Greek philosopher he was a vain babbler, and to his fellow countrymen, who looked for a manifestation of divine power after the manner of human greatness,

he was the preacher of an incredible teaching, Paul was not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, because it supplied the very thing which the world needed, divine power unto salvation.

Paul, in the section we have chosen for exposition, invites his readers to consider human history. Examination and reflection reveal the working of a great law, that godlessness and iniquity are invariably followed by divine retribution. Godlessness, or ἀσέβεια, means the absence of reverence for God, manifesting itself in disregard for His worship and neglect of His commandments. Breakdown of a real belief in God and neglect of His law result in ἀδικία, or unrighteous conduct between man and man. In other words, when belief in God and His commandments is given up justice and morality vanish too.

This fact constitutes the crucial problem for America today. The state, which has viewed with indifference the passing of belief in God and the rise of doubt and even declared atheism, is alarmed when it discovers that justice and morality are waning also. To the clear-seeing eye of Paul these things are essentially connected, and they reveal a law of God in human history, namely God's wrath against all ungodliness and unrighteousness.

Nor will Paul allow that men may be excused on the ground of ignorance. There is no excuse for the Jew, because he knows the divine will, which has been revealed to him. The Gentile lacks this special divine revelation, but he also is without excuse, for God has given to him a natural revelation. Paul would agree with the modern thinker who says that no human mind can comprehend God; but this does not mean that God is entirely unknowable. He reveals Himself to men in

two ways: First, there is an inner awareness of God. This seems to be the meaning of verse 19, where the Apostle says that God is manifest *ἐν αὐτοῖς*, that is, in their hearts and minds. This is of course the great ontological argument of Anselm. For a long time this argument has been discredited by philosophers; but it is coming back with increasing conviction. There is in all men an "urge" towards God and an awareness of obligation to obey Him. Even so thoroughgoing a scientific freethinker as Julian Huxley is puzzled by the presence of higher values and of the "numinous" in the human mind. Otto expounds the religious significance of the fact in his *Idea of the Holy*; and in his *Natural and Religious View of the World* he insists that it ranks side by side with purpose and the sense of dependence as an essential of the religious view (Rudolf Otto: *Naturalistische und Religiöse Weltansicht*, p. 30).

The ideas of purpose and dependence are linked to the second of Paul's statements, that through the things that are made, or the outward, observable world, man arrives at knowledge of two great facts, divine power, or *δύναμις*, and *θεϊότης*, or divine attributes (v. 20). Paul does not mean that we arrive by exercise of our natural mind powers at knowledge of Deity, or *θεότης*, but at the clear recognition of certain divine attributes, such as majesty, holiness, righteousness. In other words, although we do not know God in His absolute essence, we do know Him as He manifests His attributes in nature and history.

But, if it is possible for man thus to become aware of the divine operation, why is it that he does not glorify God, why does he not thank Him for His goodness and obey His commandments? In reply the Apostle gives an analysis of the human mind, which may be com-

mended for consideration to the psychologists of our own day who are loudly proclaiming that belief in God is a complex from which the human mind must be freed. Paul would regard this as very shallow thinking. He points to the obvious fact that in human experience the animal is linked to the divine. The relationship between man and woman is capable of two interpretations with two resultant developments. One is animal and bestial and results in abandoned conduct. The other tends to the divine; it is linked to the love and goodness of the home and family; it soars upward to man's highest aspirations. In Shelley's words it is:

The desire of the moth for the star,
Of the night for the morrow,
The devotion to something afar
From the sphere of our sorrow.

When the humanly wise, typified by some of our leading psychologists, approach that system of thoughts, sentiments, and ideals in the human mind, which is linked to the tenderest of human relationships on the one hand and the thought of God on the other, they regard it as foolishness. The only real thing for them is animal desire, and in place of beholding the glory of the incorruptible God their vision never rises above sensual gratification. In other words, if the urges and thoughts within man are interpreted aright, they lead to the contemplation of God's glory; if they are interpreted after the manner of one to whom sensual gratification is everything, the vision splendid fades, and in its place comes the image of the beast with its accompanying degradation of behavior. If those of the lower way no longer fashion an animal form to symbolize the controlling power in their lives, as did the heathen of Paul's day, the object of their worship and the manner

of their lives are essentially the same. In this degradation of conduct, which, as universal history testifies, is followed by ruin, we with Paul may behold the operation of the wrath of God against godlessness and iniquity.

What finally can avail to save man from the consequences of divine wrath, which by his own wrongdoing he has brought upon himself? Human wisdom, even all the knowledge that modern science has brought, will not avail, as even a casual observation of the world around us testifies. Nor can the might of any dictator or potentate, nor any form of state control. What is needed is the power of God to save man from his sin and restore him to righteousness and holiness before God. This power is proclaimed and brought to men in the message of the Cross. Therefore to our increasing realization of the wrath of God against godlessness and iniquity of men there is still joined the glad confidence that in the message of the Cross we have the divine remedy for sin and we have the hope of the world.

NEW YORK.

THE REVIEW

PRESENT THEOLOGICAL VIEWS

(The purpose of this section is not to cover in detail the field of recent publications in the sphere of theological literature, but to indicate the trends of thought in different parts of the world. It will be written especially for the busy pastor, who finds himself unable to keep up with all developments in theology, but who desires to follow their general course.)

FOR THE PAST two or three decades the old disciplines of systematic theology and apologetics, which formed so important a part of the theological curriculum in former times, have been under a cloud. The great names in both departments belong to the eighteenth and nineteenth rather than to the twentieth century. The truth of this will become apparent to anyone who will take the trouble to look at the catalogues of our best publishing firms. They contain announcements of books dealing with aspects of theology, but we look in vain for comprehensive statements. It is even worse with apologetics. Some of our seminaries have dropped this altogether as a distinct subject, and, where it is still part of the study course, the textbooks will probably be found upon examination to have been written twenty or more years ago.

There can be no question that this defect is essentially connected with the period of doubt and unbelief through which we have been passing. Seasons of vigorous faith are always accompanied by a keen interest in doctrine and its presentation in systematized form; where faith is weak the interest passes to social ethics, liturgics or a form of mysticism which hides its uncertain thinking behind vague symbols. All three are compatible with haziness and doubt concerning the essential verities of Christian faith; and in sharp contrast with the lack of books along the lines of the old disciplines we note that the

literature on Christian ethics, mysticism, and liturgy is abundant. Obviously there is no desire to set out in detail the articles of a faith held in doubt; the demand instead is for a short creed which will fit many forms of belief. Nor, if the church has lost its assured faith, can its scholars be expected to rally to the defense of that faith. It is otherwise with Christian ethics, which may be accepted even by men who think that Jesus never existed.

This does not mean that Christian ethics is of no importance. For a long time it must be in the forefront of serious Christian thinking. In an age when the existence of any standard of morality is being called in question it is the business of the Christian church to apply itself seriously to the task of defining authoritatively what constitutes right conduct. There are, for example, many questions relating to marriage and birth control which call for immediate consideration. This was recognized by the recent Lambeth Conference. The decisions of that conference may not meet with approval, but they concern fields of conduct upon which it is the duty of the church to pass judgment. Dean Inge's new book, *Christian Ethics and Modern Problems* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons), is sure to evoke discussion. Those who wish to know the trend of advanced thought in the Episcopal Church in our own country will find in the April issue of the *Anglican Theological Review* an interesting article on The Spiritual Value of Marriage, by Thomas L. Harris. The writer declares the physical relationship involved in marriage to be not only lawful but right, and even dares to say: "Orgies and revelries are degrading, but surely they are preferable to the warped minds and soured tempers of morbid Puritans" (p. 288). This is strong language, savoring of paganism. Yet the aim of the article is not to defend paganism, but to advocate the need of defining what right marriage is. The relationship of true marriage is declared to be sacramental, and it therefore becomes the duty of church leaders to encourage such marriage. It can do this only when ecclesiastical authorities instruct those

in their care about the true ideal of marriage and the aid that marriage can give to the enrichment of life.

But it is useless to discuss details of Christian ethics unless we are persuaded that what is enjoined has behind it divine authority. If the basis of Christian faith is destroyed Christian conduct, which is the fruit of the Spirit, will cease to be. Perhaps the most interesting fact in present theological thinking is a conviction that the tide of faith, which for so long has been on the ebb, is returning. There seem to be three lines of thought giving rise to the conviction.

The first is suggested by the obvious bankruptcy of rationalistic Modernism. Clearly there is some radical defect in a system of thought which is a failure, when judged by spiritual results. This general fact was brought out some four years ago by Ernest Gordon in *The Leaven of the Sadducees*. Now it is being generally acknowledged that the main contention of this book is correct; that is, the final result of rationalistic Modernism is spiritual sterility and gradual extinction. Either, therefore, there must be a return to the old faith, or the end of Christianity is in sight.

Put otherwise, Modernism is not Christianity. Those who think the two are compatible are mistaken. Either the Modernist must follow the road to Unitarianism and perhaps from there to Humanism, or he must retrace his steps towards the old position. There seems to be no escape from this dilemma. Take, for purpose of illustration, the course of higher criticism in the nineteenth century. When it first appeared, it was applied chiefly to the Old Testament, and many welcomed it as relieving them of the necessity of believing certain parts which had presented difficulty to belief. But the method could not be confined to the Old Testament; it must also be applied to the New. So the way became open for rejecting the supernatural in the New Testament as well as in the Old; and, once this is done, what is left?

Many Modernists do not wish to give a plain answer to this question, and are striving to retain the Christian faith

while doubting its foundations. This is the endeavor of Dr. John Baillie in his *The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity*. Dr. Baillie begins with the *koinonia*, or fellowship, of the early church, and makes this the center of Christian faith. In so doing he is arguing in a circle, making the effect the cause.

Dr. Potter sees the position more clearly in his *Humanism a New Religion* (New York: Simon & Schuster). He has trodden the way and knows whither it leads. Dr. Potter began as a Baptist. When after eleven years he found his own creed too broad for his denomination he became a Unitarian. At the end of another eleven years he has become a Humanist with no real belief in God at all. Of course he rejects any form of supernaturalism, which he says is inseparable from Christianity. "As long as Modernists claim to be Christian, they cannot disavow supernaturalism, which is woven into the very fabric of Christianity. It cannot be withdrawn without destroying the goods." (P. 4.) Dr. Potter is quite right in this, and it is clear that Modernism has reached the parting of the ways. The plain statement of this fact, that Modernism and Christianity tread divergent paths, is causing many to reflect, and with this reflection is coming to some a feeling that perhaps Christianity may be true after all.

Those who are thinking thus have been much encouraged by a second line of thought leading to optimism. Atomic materialism, which shed the blight of its hopelessness over the thought of the nineteenth century, is passing. Tennyson describes this hopelessness in his poem, *Despair*, and to it must be traced much of the breakdown in idealism of our age. Atomism has had a long reign, for it may be traced back to Democritus, who lived in the fourth and fifth centuries B.C. With the rise of modern astronomy and physics atomism was revived, until it was believed that the ultimate reality is atoms, and the universe a vast machine. The discovery of radium however so changed the viewpoint of science that today men like Eddington, Millikan, Thomson, and Whitehead, who stand

in the forefront of scientific thinking, are declaring that the mechanistic idea is entirely wrong, and that we must seek a spiritualistic interpretation of reality. Haldane, McDougall, and others are performing a similar task for biology and psychology.

One of the most interesting books in this development of thought is written by Rudolf Otto, author of *The Idea of the Holy*. It is called *The Naturalistic and the Religious View of the World*, and those acquainted with German will find it most instructive. Otto finds three movements in the religious view: Teleology or Providence, dependence, and mystery. Everywhere we find a revival of the old idea of teleology. But, if we have divine plan and purpose, there is surely room for belief in a divine plan of salvation. The Modernist who does not want to become a Unitarian, much less a Humanist, is seizing upon this idea, and is beginning to try to retrace his steps towards the old faith.

The third line of thought is linked to the great movement in Germany connected with the name of Karl Barth. The Barthians are clear that we have reached a crisis. They are sure that Modernism is not Christianity, and that the absence of a clear definition of sin in modern theology is due in large measure to the mystical and pantheistic tendencies imported from the Romanticism in the poetry and philosophy of the nineteenth century. In opposition to pantheistic immanence Barth and his school affirm uncompromisingly the transcendence of God.

There is also in Germany generally just now, both in philosophy and religion, a distinct trend towards a reassertion of the transcendence of God. Outside the Barthian school, for example, we have F. K. Schumann's *Idea of God and the Decay of Modernism* (J. C. B. Mohr). Schumann affirms that mysticism and idealism are irreconcilable with the Biblical conception of God. He is in accord with Barth in maintaining that Protestantism must return to the fundamental ideas of Luther and Calvin, that theology must be Theo-centric and not

anthropo-centric; above all that it must return to the Bible as the Word of God.

Those who wish to comprehend more clearly the Barthian viewpoint will find three books in English that will together provide a good general statement. First there is Horton's translation of Karl Barth's *The Word of God and the Word of Man* (Pilgrim Press). Then there are Emil Brunner's lectures on *The Theology of Crisis* (Scribner's). Recently a most useful book, *The Teaching of Karl Barth*, has been published by R. Birch Hoyle, a regular contributor, by the way, to this quarterly (London: Student Christian Union Press). Together these three books will furnish a fairly adequate presentation for English readers. We shall probably return to this subject in a later summary.

Meanwhile we may say briefly that the Barthian school is strongly anti-Modernist, that they affirm vigorously the Deity of Christ and the divine plan of salvation, upon which man must depend absolutely, and that they make the preaching of the Word of God essential. Nevertheless they differ from American Fundamentalism in not insisting on verbal inspiration and in even allowing comparatively liberal views regarding the authorship and contents of the books of Scripture. Brunner, for instance, is liberal in his interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.

It will be seen, therefore, that they are in their teachings providing a home for Modernists who hold liberal views on Biblical criticism, but who affirm the Deity of Christ and His atoning work. It will be interesting to see the reaction of Fundamentalists to this attitude, and also to observe the forms which Barthianism will take in the English-speaking world. Already it is influencing our American thought, and we may expect that ere long an animated discussion will arise regarding the validity of its reasoning.

ANDREW R. OSBORN.

CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

HERE, IN BRIEF, POINTED SENTENCES, ARE IDEAS EXPRESSED BY various people in recent periodicals and books. They do not necessarily represent the views of this quarterly, but are presented as examples of things being said and written:

"The first quality of a vital faith is the power to persist."
—*Dr. Lewis M. Hale in The Watchman-Examiner.*

"Dangerous? Decidedly. But the man who would escape danger made his great mistake when he consented to be born."
—*The Churchman.*

"There are some rich blessings which, strangely it often seems, we cannot receive from God except in periods of supreme difficulty."—*Zion's Herald.*

"We are distressed because our churches are half empty. Many of them would be emptier if the Gospel was preached in them."—*Dean W. R. Inge.*

"Too much war is being made over words that mean one thing to one person and quite another thing to another person."
—*The Watchman-Examiner.*

"When we heard of him [Hitler] we feared him, but since we heard him our alarm has greatly abated."—*Dr. H. H. Marlin in The United Presbyterian.*

"With all due respect to the historians, they, too, are men of like passions with us, and they are not a little subjective."—*Olfert Ricard in Christ and His Men.*

"Instead of being faced with an over-supply of ministers, we are in the midst of an under-conviction of the opportunity to extend the Kingdom of God."—*The Lutheran.*

"The grossly prosperous ones have never blessed life, but have cursed life or have let it sink. Only the sufferers have spoken up for life and for God."—*The British Weekly.*

"God is on the side, not of the 'strongest battalions,' but of all those who in humility and faith put away the trivial for the sake of the eternal."—*William H. P. Faunce in The Baptist.*

"We cannot believe in the goodness which prudently withdraws within its own borders, which is afraid of the risks of active service in a hostile or indifferent world."—*Rev. A. T. Cadoux in The Expository Times*.

"In my estimation there are enough drys in the country to maintain the dry law, reinforce it and see to it that it is made effective. There are enough drys—provided they are all awake."—*Hon. Gifford Pinchot*.

"We transmute our time, our energies, our abilities, our very lives, into money, and the way in which we spend or mispend that money is a true measure of the way in which we spend or mispend our lives."—*Home and Foreign Fields*.

"Though asceticism as such is a one-sided exaggeration, it merely over-stresses an essential of all deep religion. Some renunciation of the temporal must ever be the price paid for the eternal."—*Evelyn Underhill in The Spectator (London)*.

"The statistics of student religion show that the young people come to college possessed of the beliefs still accepted in their homes, but that probably 40 to 45 per cent of them, on leaving college, either deny or doubt the fundamental dogmas of the Christian religion."—*The Congregationalist*.

"Everywhere thoughtful people who have studied the trend of the times are turning away baffled by the human remedies proposed for prevailing ills. They look wistfully to the Christian Church, which claims to possess the only key to the salvation of individuals and society."—*The Christian Advocate*.

"Paul is no longer studied as a stern logician or a systematic theologian; he is seen to be above all a Christian believer who speaks out of his own experience, and a missionary preacher whose supreme and passionate desire is to interpret and commend the grace of Christ to men."—*The Expository Times*.

A STRONG FAITH IS ESSENTIALLY HOPEFUL AND EVEN PROPHETIC. It always faces the dawn. Doubtless all law-abiding citizens, regardless of religious views or the lack of them, want to see human society free from many ancient burdens—immorality, crime, war, oppression, and all the dark list. But where is to be found the hope for this vast emancipation?

Albert J. McCartney supplies an answer in *The Audacity of Faith*, a sermon published in *The Christian Century Pulpit*, from which we quote from the section called "The Fading out of the Cross":

"The doctrine of the cross has all too meager a place in our thinking, our acting and even in our preaching. With much gusto we sing, 'Simply to Thy cross I cling,' while we cling to anything else but the cross. We cling to the stock market in the hope of retrieving our losses, we cling to the movies to relieve our boredom, we cling to our law commission to save us from crime, to the eighteenth amendment to save us from intemperance, to international conferences to save us from war; but when the cross fades out of the crusader's sky, that cause is as good as lost.

"Let us put the wondrous cross back where it belongs. I believe that the tide will turn and the man who holds on and cherishes the Christian values now is the man who will triumph most in that hour. God cannot be defeated, and as sure as we live, popular sentiment will again cherish the Christian virtues and the Christian beliefs, and will underwrite the Christian program. For life without God is becoming more and more intolerable, and the avid hunger for real religion is becoming vocal all about us. With all my heart I want to help. My limitations are legion, and while I am not a light, I can bear witness to that Light, so I consecrate myself to the task and the opportunity to which you have called me, with abounding enthusiasm."

IT IS HARDLY POSSIBLE TO OVEREMPHASIZE THE DIFFERENCE between real, essential Christianity and a merely ethical system that has borrowed the livery of the faith. There are many pulpits which are urging the finest moral standards and extolling all that is good and helpful in life, but which have substituted some form of Humanism for the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Saviour and Lord. Christianity proclaims moral achievement as the result of a divinely changed nature—"a new creation"; a good bit of our current preaching offers a changed nature as the result of moral achievement, and makes the offer so inclusive that no particular attitude respecting our divine Lord is demanded.

Dean Inge in a recent address quoted this saying of Amiel, which forcibly expresses much the same idea: "Christianity brings and preaches salvation by the conversion of the will, humanism by the emancipation of the mind. The one wishes to enlighten by making better, the other to make better by enlightening."

The present tendency is cogently set forth by *The Watchman-Examiner* in this brief editorial:

"There is a threefold tendency quite evident today. The first is that of reducing Christ to a good man with a great message—the highest type of manhood in whom we have an illustration of what man in himself may become. Christ's vicarious suffering and death on the cross are either ignored or repudiated. The second tendency is that of reducing Christianity to a system of ethics. The new birth is considered unnecessary. The primary emphasis is placed on one's relationship to his fellowmen. A recent book seeks to lay its emphasis 'where Paul laid his, not on theology but on morals'! The author is evidently not acquainted with Paul's epistle to the Romans. The third tendency is that of reducing the church to a mere social organization. Strange how a little truth over-emphasized can pervert truth in its larger aspects! Such over-emphasis has turned many of our churches into club houses and places of entertainment. Over against these modern tendencies is Jesus Christ, 'the same yesterday, today and forever.' The Christianity needed for our age is apostolic Christianity, a Christianity made courageous and stable by nearness to the Christ."

IS IT TRUE THAT THE CHURCH AS A WHOLE IS LOSING HER MESSAGE? If so, what remains as her peculiar function in the world? Has she anything to give that the highest ethical training and the most devoted sacrifice for others cannot supply? It is a curious thing that, in this day of interest in psychology, even many church leaders are blind to the fact that you could not have any strong, aggressive, enduring organization were there in men no inherent instinct to which a moving appeal could be made. The most persistent and disturbing consciousness in the secret heart of the natural man is that he stands hopelessly

lost as a condemned sinner—unless some power beyond himself comes to the rescue.

Now, the church of our Lord has the only message that can bring any hope of such rescue. Moreover, it is the very message that Paul and the victorious early church proclaimed, and all consecrated leaders and all branches of the true church since. This is the proclamation of atonement through the Cross of Christ. The reason why the message of the Cross is supreme is that it satisfies a man in his utmost need. The Cross is at once the hope of the sinner and the organizing bond of the saved. The church does indeed have other truths that enter into her life and are expressed in her activities; but the one that permeates all and gives them meaning is the atonement won on the Cross. Without this central fact all questions of right and wrong become more or less academic, and all noble conduct at last leaves life as hopeless as a flame that is flickering out.

These paragraphs from an article in *The Bible To-Day*, written by Mr. Hugh R. Monro, a leading lay writer, cover the pulpit's failing emphasis upon the Cross in recent years and the results that follow such preaching:

"Looking back a single generation, we find that the doctrine of Christ's substitutionary atonement was strongly emphasized in preaching and teaching as the central article of the Christian creed. In pulpit, Bible-school, Young Men's Christian Association classes, and in tracts and evangelical literature, this was the leading theme. In widespread, soul-winning effort, individual and organized, the atoning work of Christ was universally the line of approach. Those of us who received our early religious instruction and had our earliest contact with organized Christian effort in those days came under the strong impress of this great truth. The entire interpretation of the Bible was from the standpoint of Christ's death on behalf of sinners, and the basis of Christian effort was the appeal to come to Him on the ground of His sacrifice upon the Cross. It was in similar terms that the great evangelistic and missionary enterprises at home and abroad conveyed their message.

"How radically all this has changed! One may go through

columns of church announcements in the daily press without finding a single theme dealing with the need of Christ's blood ransom. The current religious books, the Bible-school helps, the missionary literature—with rare exceptions—have nothing of the crimson tinge. They are substantially bloodless. Seldom is a voice raised in any prominent pulpit proclaiming Christ's atoning death as the only way of salvation! The announcement of such a discourse would occasion comment. Nor is this a sweeping indictment of present-day pulpit testimony. Literary and ethical discourses are by no means universal. There are more than a few to uphold the great doctrinal affirmations with deep conviction and power, but with growing infrequency do we hear a clear-cut testimony concerning this corner-stone of the edifice of faith. And what has brought about the change? Doubtless, a number of causes, but we believe chief among them the fact that this doctrine of the blood has been the central point of attack by the forces of unbelief. From the standpoint of human reason, this doctrine is not alone untenable, but is highly offensive. It has been scathingly referred to as the 'doctrine of the shambles,' as though those capable of holding such a view were men and women of unrefined instincts and lacking in intelligence."

"The infection invariably begins with a modified view of the Cross. There may be an adherence to the old forms of speech, and the central place of sacrifice in Christian teaching may be strongly affirmed, but the doctrine of atoning blood will have become a remnant of first century Judaism or a survival of mediæval theology. We are sometimes chided with the statement that the gross literalism of this Calvary emphasis should be left to Romanism; but this is to forget that some of the most seraphic souls of early and mediæval times, whose memory is no less the possession of Protestantism, were inspired by the faith which centers in the Cross, so that it became the theme of their immortal witness and their inspired song. The Cross may thus be said to stand in the center of God's spiritual universe. All paths of vital Christian experience must lead to it. It stands not as a symbol or a memory, but as a present, quickening fact. Its efficacy is our constant, imperative need."

THE VERY CHARACTER AND DIGNITY OF SOME ORGANIZATIONS, AS of some men, command our attention and lend no little weight to their pronouncements. The Annual Conference of Modern

Churchmen, in England, would hardly be called an organization of pious fanatics, hence any warning issuing from its sessions must come from a definite conviction that a real danger exists. At the Seventeenth Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen, held the past summer at Oxford, the general subject was Problems of Personal Life. *The Modern Churchman* has devoted an entire issue to important papers delivered there by prominent British churchmen, and from that by J. C. Hardwick, on The Disintegration of Morality, we take several paragraphs that are especially striking in view of the cultured and intellectual group of whose expressions they formed a part:

“But whether beliefs decay owing to circumstances or because they have been intellectually refuted, there can be no doubt that when beliefs change, ethical standards follow suit. But we are not entitled to assume that a discarded belief was necessarily a true belief, or that the morality which has been abandoned was a perfect morality. The beliefs and the morality based thereupon may both have been hopelessly out of date, and ripe for replacement.

“No doubt some beliefs would have a more direct bearing upon conduct than others. For example, an assured belief that the Ten Commandments were written by the veritable finger of God might be expected to have a direct bearing upon conduct. In the first place there would be no room for doubt about the content of the moral law, and in the second place there would be no doubt about the rewards and punishments which would follow obedience or disobedience. Both these elements of certainty might be expected to form a solid basis for morality. But when belief in the supernatural authority and origin of the Commandments has disappeared, it becomes possible not only to disobey them, but to criticize them, and to say that their content ought to be different. In other words, the Commandments carry no more weight (if as much) as an Order in Council.

“The results of other beliefs might be more indirect, though not less effective, by producing a sort of moral scepticism, such as some modern psychology seems to induce in its disciples. One might reach the conclusion that moral distinctions cannot be taken seriously, and that in any case the human species, as a sort of odious vermin, is a tribe to which one owes little,

in the way of duties, and from which one can expect as little in return."

"On the other hand there are plenty of people who can tell us how to control our behaviour, and can offer us an up-to-date version of Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises* (has Pelmanism yet gone out of fashion?), but they can give us no ideal at which to aim—save perhaps the ideal of business success. Psychology can make us virtuous (so it claims), but can it tell us anything about virtue? Until he can do this there is very little point in leaving the priest for the psychologist. It is easy to exaggerate the value of any science. Chemistry has given us dyes and manures, but it has also given us explosives and poison gas; and psychology, if it teaches us to educate children, also teaches us to miseducate them. My own view is that the reason why education has hitherto done so little harm is that it has been providentially inefficient. If education should ever become efficient, the results would be frightful."

THE SPIRITUAL AND MORAL CONDITION OF THE YOUNGER GENERATION is occupying more attention on the part of the pulpit and religious press than any problem the church has before it. Yet the church and its educational institutions are at least as responsible for the irreligion and laxity among youth as are any other agencies that influence them.

There has always been unbelief, infidelity, atheism, and the rest in the world. But the church has distinguished herself, even maintained herself, by her open and vigorous warfare on these things. And this warfare has not been simply one of warning against all this negative and destructive propaganda. It has been waged by the courageous and vigorous preaching of positive truth, truth that has the inspired Scriptures back of it and the convicting and convincing Spirit of God in it. It is in this way that converts have been won, that believers have been sustained and encouraged, and that Christian moral standards have gained recognition in the world.

But how do matters stand today, and what should be done? Here is an answer taken from an editorial in a recent issue of *The Essentialist*:

"The current compromising of ethical standards by out-

standing leaders of thought and ideals is a serious situation. It is a withering blight that is imperiling the very foundations of moral life in thousands of our educated American youths. Unless this abuse is corrected we will reap the whirlwind. After all, Christianity and civilization are pre-eminently ideas; and if these ideas are uprooted the glory will be gone. What we might call the raw material of life has scarcely changed in the last two thousand years. Life has the same possibilities today as it had when the Roman populace threw, unashamed, their undesired babies into the street, and amused themselves by watching fellow men bleed and die in the arena. The difference between a pagan world and a Christian world is the difference in its ideas, its faith; and if we teach a generation insincerity, untruth, evasion, equivocation, we must expect to reap the consequences. He who would be useful as an ethical teacher must first of all be a man of high and consistent ideals. The scientific passion: 'the quest for truth' is useful; but the Biblical passion: of telling the truth, of sincerity in all relationships, of making one's yea yea, and one's nay nay, is much more useful. Civilization in America needs a great revival. It needs a great ethical revival and it needs to have it begin in the universities and among the leaders of truth. Wall Street doubtless has many sins to answer for, but in absolute straightforwardness, Wall Street could set an example to many of those who are teaching and preaching ethical reform.

"In the middle west this summer, a middle aged Modernist preacher came to the altar of a camp meeting. He said he wanted to find God. He said that there were scores of laymen in his church who knew God better than he did; that he was ashamed to stand before these godly men and women and try to preach. He said when he prayed the sky was brass above his head; that God was unreal to him. When asked if he believed that Jesus Christ was God incarnate, and that He had died for our sins, he said he believed in Christ, but not in His cross. 'That is slaughter-house religion!' he said. He had read the liberal books. He had hated and ignored the books that opposed them and expressed the evangelical position. And there he knelt, broken, disheartened, defeated, groping. But such suffering hearts are not the worst result of unbelief and compromised truth in the universities. The educated young manhood and womanhood of America, having been robbed of their own exalting faith in Christ and in ideals are going out from the schools to ignore the Church, to live little worldly

lives, and by their influence and example to undermine the faith and ideals of that larger multitude who did not have their educational privileges."

WITH ALL THEIR EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE, CERTAIN MINISTERS are continually betraying the fact that they have never actually comprehended the great message of the Christian ministry. To these men may be commended such a book as Brunner's *Theology of Crisis*, recently reviewed in these pages. One blunder of such shepherds of the flock is that they put Christianity on the same basis as philosophy—a working out of some profound problem. The following comment, credited to Henry Sloane Coffin, puts the matter as it is:

"Much is said today of religion as a quest, but you go to minister no vague deity. Our mission is not primarily to invite folk to join us in a quest but to share with them a discovery. A Christian minister is not a seeker after God, but one entrusted with the good news that God is in Christ."

IT SEEMS IRREVERENT, ALMOST BLASPHEMOUS, TO SPEAK OF MEN preventing God from carrying out His plans. Yet, since He sees fit to work with man in certain things, man must do his part or the plan has to be changed or abandoned altogether. The Bible bears testimony to this, even in the deeds and words of our Lord Himself. This fact opens a great field for profitable reflection concerning the individual Christian's relation to his Lord in everyday affairs and in his soul life, and concerning the progress and accomplishments of the church.

In a sermon published in *The Christian Century Pulpit* J. Stuart Holden, the noted British preacher, devotes this passage to a consideration of things that Christ might have done, but could not, because of hindering human failure:

"It is clear that more than once he was on the point of doing a miracle but was somehow hindered. And while, in the end, his full and final revelation of God to man in every essential particular was not thereby weakened nor vitiated nor made less than perfect and adequate, the point of the reflection is that if he was hindered then it is possible he may be hindered now. The thought cannot be avoided that if men missed some-

thing of what might have been when he companied with them during those eventful years, we too, for similar reasons, may be missing something altogether vital of his creative love and power. If his intention could be thwarted then it may be thwarted now also. Hence nothing can be more important than that we should, with sincere intention, examine ourselves, lest we come to stand to others as some of the men of his earthly day stand to us—just warning illustrations of the Christian miracle that might have been but that did not happen.

“For let us have no uncertainty about this. It is only the Christ of miraculous power who is adequate to meet our moral and spiritual need. We may have succeeded, in this enlightened age of ours, in dispelling from our minds many of the shadows of ancient superstitions. And that is a gain. Are we so sure that in accomplishing this we have not also sacrificed the desirable sense of mystery and miracle? It is all to the good that we should be emancipated from the bondage of every false loyalty. But the loss of awe, of reverence, of faith in the God whom Christ revealed, is far from good. It was the glory of his earliest followers that having nothing they yet possessed all things. It is too often our shame that having all things we yet possess nothing.”

HUMANITY MAKES PROGRESS THROUGH STRUGGLE AND SUFFERING. More liberal forms of government have not replaced old despotisms as the result of impassionate, logical argument and orderly referendum. In social relationships the old has ever been the bitter enemy of the new. No scheme of government or of economic adjustment has ever brought satisfaction to people generally, and so we find history repeating itself as the race endlessly seeks a more excellent way.

There seems to be a growing feeling that all economic and social devices, taken alone, must fail, and that true improvement must come by spiritual and moral means. There is a touch of this idea in this extract in *The Churchman* by Lester Leake Riley, and evidently influenced by the Middletown conferences:

“It was the ‘hungry forties’ that brought the deadly parallel between Humanity and Property to the fore. Lord Shaftesbury’s Factory Acts and the Chartist Movement

echoed the bitter cry of the oppressed. Out of that maelstrom of turbulent humanity came the modern Labor movement. Men weighed in this bitter struggle the outworn ideas of a past social order and found them wanting. The stout heart and broad sword of the Elizabethan political and social scene failed miserably in the development of any intelligence adequate to cope with this social revolt. Religious institutions, stabilized to support the old order and seeking, as all institutions tend to do, their own security, appealed in vain to the goodness of men's hearts but never turned the heritage of the fine sensibilities of the individual conscience to meet this social debacle. That is not unlike the dilemma of today. The stout heart, the broad sword, and mere goodness in itself are not enough. There is a moral obligation to be intelligent, but intelligence has not yet found ready to hand the weapons of the spiritual armory equal to battle with the problems of our corporate civilization."

THE THING THAT MAKES NARROW AND SUPERFICIAL THE MAN who lives a life of small routine is not necessarily a lack of native capacity, but a lack of seeing things in the large. He is engrossed with details, with small plans, with petty views. His mind is not given a chance to deal with big things, so it has little opportunity to grow. The same is of course true of the spiritual life. People do not give themselves to thoughts of great things, of the future, of their larger relation to their fellows, and above all of the vast meaning of their relation to God. So they wither spiritually.

What is true of the individual is true also of the church. This applies especially today. Our churches are so occupied with the problems of their organization, and even of their perpetuation, that the reason for their existence is given secondary consideration, if not lost sight of altogether. Fred Smith, in an article in *Zion's Herald* upon spiritual perspective, puts the vital importance of this matter in these words:

"The church that forgets to horizon itself with eternity soon suffers a distinctive change. The function of the prophet is given up for that of the policeman. For the prophet thinks in terms of eternity; the policeman in terms of an environment. Therefore we have a church that can produce 'Marthas'—

people who are busy about many things; but for some reason the church is not molding men of the martyr breed.

"And the reason is not far to seek. Martyrs are born of the breath of eternity. The men of virtue must have long vistas. The foreshortened life is inevitably the handicapped life. Paul even declares that it is the miserable life. 'If in this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.' Spiritual health requires eternity for its horizon. No age discounts this fact save at dire peril. And in this fact we have the explanation of much that is regretful in our day. I had almost said we have mixed our values, perhaps it will be better to say that we have materialized them. Or rather we have put them in the frame of time when we should have evaluated them as related to the panorama of eternity."

DOGMA HAS BEEN SEVERELY DISCOURAGED IN LATE YEARS, and to describe a religious teacher as dogmatic has been almost equivalent to labeling his views and methods as hopelessly antiquated. Yet there are voices, strong voices, here and there which proclaim the value of that positive form of utterance we call dogmatism. In an article upon Dogma and Its Value in Preaching, published in *The Congregational Quarterly* (London), William A. Painter says:

"There is attached to the wall in a certain thoroughfare a small signboard advertising a neighbouring Adult School. At the foot of it is displayed the phrase: 'No Politics, No Class, No Creed!' One has sometimes wondered in what way men may be supposed to be attracted by these words. This curious list of negations is assumed to be a recommendation. 'No Politics . . . No Creed'; we stand for nothing at all, there is nothing to believe! One is inclined to say: 'When you have found something worth holding to, and standing for, then put it up on your board. But do not advertise the emptiness of your position.' There are some Churches and ministers who seem to find equal delight in the boast that they have no Creed, that they offer to the seeker nothing that he need believe!"

"The Church's wisdom, divinely inspired, is enshrined in her dogma, always the storm centre, yet always the rallying point. We must not be obscurantist, willing to accept with no effort to understand. We ought, on the contrary, to expend our best endeavour to express truth in terms that come near to modern habits of thought."

IN OUR AGE WE LIKE EVERYTHING REDUCED TO EXACT FIGURES. It is the age of quantitative analysis, of statistics and charts and graphs. It is not so strange, then, that some good people attempt to reckon the religious factors in their lives in some such tangible manner. Perhaps it gives them a greater sense of the reality of these things, even though the greatest joys of life must forever remain beyond calculation and tabulation. Who can reduce to percentages the relative merits of a group of masterpieces on canvas or of different friendships?

However, some are inclined to estimate religious blessings on the basis of the money put into them. As quoted by *The Literary Digest*, from *The Homiletic Review*, a Washington lawyer, Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., in an article in the latter publication, tells us that his religion costs him \$2,000 a year. But Mr. LaRoe does not stop with such a valuation; he gives these reasons for his support of the church:

"I love to work and I love to play, but neither seems to provide me with a real philosophy of life. The legitimate stage provides amusement, and a certain degree of art, but the Church is the only place where I find myself really in touch with those spiritual forces which lift me above the ordinary level of my routine and inspire me with a new purpose, and give a new meaning to life."

"Something inside of me tells me that there is a spark of eternity in me that will never die, and I am willing to pay something for a definite philosophy which will keep that spark alive and make me feel that there is life beyond the grave.

"The Christian Church provides that very thing, and does it in a more satisfying way than all the philosophers from Aristotle to William James.

"After carefully considering my investments and their respective yields, I have reached the definite conclusion that my investment in religion is paying me a better return than my bonds, stocks, equipment trust certificates, or first mortgages. And it will be a difficult matter for a bond salesman to convince me to the contrary.

"Here is one investment which is never impaired by a stock-market crash; in which the annual dividend is never passed; and which need not be kept in a safe-deposit vault to prevent theft."

WHY IS THE ENGLISH BIBLE SO COMMONLY ACCEPTED AS A model of literary style? Even men who deny its truths or are indifferent to its commands are impressed by its sublime language. It is, none the less, an odd fact that many of its preachers and teachers fail in their own utterances to profit by its example of clear, simple, direct, dignified expression. Technical terms and academic style, not to mention any effort to display a little learning, too often spoil what should be an effective sermon. Note in your own mind what are some of the chief points in good, straightforward, understandable English, and then see how the Bible illustrates these things.

Professor Charles Luther Williams of Denison University has, in the *Crozer Quarterly*, paid this tribute to the Authorized Version of the Scriptures:

"The English Bible economizes the attention of its readers more than any other important book in the world, and the reason for this resides in the fact that the diction of the English Bible is ideal. This is particularly true of the Authorized or King James version, whatever may be said as to the correctness of the translation in some places; and no speaker will employ hazy, lifeless, or uncouth English whose style has been formed under the influence of the English Bible, as was true of men so widely apart in some respects as Abraham Lincoln and John Ruskin. Why is this? The diction of the Authorized version is as clear as the most transparent window glass. It is direct, it does not beat about the bush. There are no dodging circumlocutions, no softly padded euphemisms. If a man has lied, the English Bible does not speak in a mincing way of what he has done. It calls him a liar, and lets the matter go at that. The diction of the English Bible is as natural as the smile of a babe or the song of a canary, for those who made the Authorized version were too serious to indulge in literary vanity of any sort."

A PREACHER NEED NOT BE THE VICTIM OF INTELLECTUAL VANITY or be chargeable with preaching over the heads of his congregation if he occasionally employs a bit of Greek exegesis. There are offensive, and there are attractive and helpful, ways of going about this. Every layman who loves his Bible ought

to enjoy and profit by an explanation of the meaning of some word or phrase that clarifies and enlarges his understanding of the matter referred to. Here is a bit of exegesis by "Watchman" in *The British Weekly* which illustrates the point. After speaking of Paul's use of the terms translated in English by "sincere" and "sincerity," the writer continues:

"Now—and this is something which is continually forgotten alike by preachers and by devout laymen—the New Testament was written in Greek. St. Paul did not write the word 'sincere' or the word 'sincerity.' He did not pronounce anyone 'sincere': he pronounced him *eilikrines*. He did not praise 'sincerity': what he praised was *eilikrinia*.

"Now let the humblest and least erudite of my readers take a look at those cryptic-seeming words, and let him or her do this without fear. For we all of us already know a great deal of Greek, so that indeed we cannot open our mouths without using that ancient language. You will observe that the trunk of each of these words (one being the adjective, the other the substantive) is *krin*. *That* contains the idea of *judgment*, as appears at once in such words as *crisis* and *critical*.

"The other and earlier root in the word you will further observe is *eili*. Now, *eili* is simply *eile*, and this means 'the sun' or 'the warmth of the sun.'

"There you are! A 'sincere' man is one who can come out into the light, and can stand in the light. He is one who can bear 'the test of light.'

"Anyone whose blessed and enviable vocation it is 'to handle the Word of God,' week by week, and who does not see in these things matter to preach upon for the rest of his life, lacks surely that sensitiveness and receptivity which are the proofs of the high vocation!"

THERE IS NO BETTER INDEX OF THE HEALTH OF ANY DENOMINATION than its missionary zeal. Yet just now Protestant churches are mightily concerned over shrinking missionary collections. Various and vigorous are the efforts being made to meet the situation; but at present it is still so serious that something more than missionary organization, missionary education, missionary addresses, missionary literature, and frantic

missionary "appeals" is needed to restore to the church her interest in bringing the Gospel to all men.

May not the problem, after all, be of a spiritual nature? Certainly anyone who reads his New Testament must realize that the heart of the whole trouble is the present spiritual apathy of the church. Unless she recovers new life, matters must grow worse, both at home and abroad. After reviewing briefly the unfavorable state of American Protestantism, as revealed by the latest statistics, a writer in a recent issue of the *Church School Journal*, Dr. Gratz, made this observation: "We are on the eve of a new civilization that is so different from the one to which we have grown accustomed that only that which is alive can survive."

If Protestantism's endeavor to evangelize the world is slowing down at present, what of Roman Catholic aims and plans and operations at this same time? Writing upon *The New Catholic Imperialism*, in *Current History* (copyright, published by The New York Times Company), Beniamino De Ritis, an Italian writer of note, gives us an account of the extent of the forces directed by the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. We learn that a recent census of Catholic missionary activities carried on under this agency shows, among other items, that there are 163,615 persons at work, including European priests, native priests, and various lay workers; 3,635 parishes or semi-parishes; 46,465 missionary settlements; 31,418 establishments for training the personnel, with 1,521,710 students; 691 hospitals; 1,525 orphanages; and 164 printing shops. Another point of interest is that this field of Catholic work has 281 bishops, 24,305 native priests, and 28,938 European priests. The interest of the Pope in the missionary department of his church is indicated in these paragraphs, of particular interest to Protestant missionary leaders:

"The appointment of Bishops belonging to the various countries in which the missions are working has been a new step toward making the Church a national rather than a foreign institution. In this regard the program in China is of

great significance. It is inspired by the principle of nationalizing the clergy in order to Christianize the nation, thus forestalling anti-foreign criticism against Catholic priests, who would otherwise appear to the Chinese to represent European powers. Recently Pius XI appointed the first Chinese and Japanese Bishops with impressive ceremonies in St. Peter's. It is expected that gradually the native clergy will be entrusted with the mission of extending the Catholic faith among their own countrymen.

"The Vatican never loses hope of the union of Oriental orthodox churches and even some Protestant denominations through this missionary work which extols the advent of the 'Reign of Christ.' This 'Reign of Christ,' according to the mystic definition contained in the encyclical *Quas primas* issued by Pius XI in 1925, includes in our own time the possibility of the reunion of all the churches under a single leader for a mutual purpose. Pope Pius XI five years ago instituted in the Catholic liturgy the 'Feast of the Reign of Christ' which is celebrated on Oct. 31. The 'Reign of Christ' is an empire of souls governed by a divine law and order. 'Imperfect, temporary and human manifestations of this divine law and order are States and governments which, by approaching the ideal of peace and order of the spiritual kingdom, are seeking fulfilment. The Church is entrusted with the mission of preaching the true interpretation of Christ's rule.' The new Catholic missionary policy is endeavoring to demonstrate that each Catholic has a double allegiance—one to his political régime, which does not concern the Church because of its temporary character; the other to the divine law and order, which is the Church and is eternal. This same principle emphasizes that Catholicism should be a universal religion and anticipates the time when all peoples, regardless of race, political affiliation and material possessions, will be considered equal citizens in the kingdom of the reign of Christ. It is as spiritual units in this reign that the Chinese, Japanese and Negroes are already considered capable of securing for the Catholic empire the elements of a native clergy and episcopate on the same basis as the white races.

"Another phase of this new imperialism is the widely discussed question of the internationalization of the Sacred College of Cardinals and the prospect in the not too far distant future of a non-Italian Pope. The Pope is no longer the sovereign of the temporal domains of the Church, but only the

sovereign of the Vatican City. This closely follows the lines of the original Vatican City of early Christianity, which arose at the foot of the Vatican Hill, where Nero had an amphitheatre and where St. Peter is believed to have been put to death. As ruler of the temporal domains of the Church in central Italy, the Pope had for centuries a double character; he was head of the Universal Church as well as head of the Italian principate. This double character was largely responsible for the predominance acquired by the Italian element in the Sacred College of Cardinals and in all the administrative departments of the central government of the Church. Even after the fall of the temporal power in 1870, the Church clung to the tradition of having a prevalence of Italian Cardinals and prelates in the Curia. The internal policy of the Church clearly indicates that the Vatican will adhere to the old tradition for a long time to come. Notwithstanding the fact that the Roman question has been solved, the missionary problem has opened out new horizons; and in addition to American, English, Italian and French Catholicism, there is now a Chinese, Japanese and Indian Catholic Church in the making.

"Since there are no revolutions in the Church, changes are wrought only by an extremely slow and cautious process of evolution. The Pope is an absolute ruler, but his absolutism is always tempered by the power of tradition. Although today the Vatican is developing the Church in various nations under the control of the natives of those countries, it is endeavoring to Romanize the foreign clergy by training it in the ecclesiastical colleges and national seminaries which are erected in Rome under the direct and immediate supervision of the Pope. At the same time the position of the Sacred College of Cardinals is somewhat changing and seems to be losing ground, inasmuch as the Pope is concentrating more and more in himself all general powers and policies and assuming full responsibility for them."

THE PRESENT RUSSIAN SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT MAY BE OPPRESSIVE, brutal, and godless, as it is, but it shows great shrewdness and foresight in one thing at least. The Soviet government has its eye upon Russia's children as the main hope of its permanent endurance. The Roman Church, an organization quite the opposite, shows the same wise concern about its childhood. On the other hand Protestantism seems to have lost its sense

of the importance of proper child training. *The Christian Advocate* has thrown into contrast the Russian way and that of America respecting this infinitely important matter:

"There is at least one feature of Soviet policy that has demonstrated its usefulness, and of which we must avail ourselves if we are to perpetuate our own institutions.

"It is the attention given to the training of the young.

"This is the terrible strength of the Russian program. The farsighted Soviet chiefs soon saw that they could not win over the present adult generation. Their hope lay ahead. If they could hold their own by terror, force, and roseate promises until the present adult generation should retire from active conduct of affairs, and at the same time could mold the minds of the children to Bolshevik ideas and thought-forms, the future would be assured.

"This they accordingly set themselves to do. They have spent money for agricultural machinery, but they have spent more for schools. They have imported expensive technicians from America and Western Europe to develop power-plants, mechanical refrigeration, railways, mines, oil refineries, but they have been quite as zealous in the field of educational engineering.

"No child attends a school in Russia without being indoctrinated with hero-worship for Lenin, with abhorrence of capitalism, and with contempt for religion."

"Without the reading of the Scriptures and the practise of prayer in the home, only slight religious impression can be made upon the young.

"Yet these fundamentals are largely neglected. The schools, public as well as private (always excepting the parochial school), can not legally give formal religious teaching. In most families, children have ceased to attend church. This crowds the whole responsibility upon the church school (Sunday-school), which is unfortunately so poorly equipped with teachers that its work, however valuable, falls far below any adequate standard of efficiency.

"The time is ripe for a rededication of the Church to its work as a teacher.

"The churches must be made to realize their responsibility so keenly that their most intelligent members will accept training as teachers, and every member will give of his substance to

provide educational buildings and equipment worthy of this indispensable branch of service.

"One thing is sure. If the present neglect of Christian child-training is permitted to continue for another quarter-century, the Church will face such a crisis as it has not met in centuries."

AFTER A PERIOD OF GREAT PERIL OR STRESS IT IS DIFFICULT TO interest the public very deeply in resulting disturbances that seem small by contrast. The Great War left men weary of the whole wretched business and anxious to resume their usual lives. This was surely true of America, and reports about the state of the churches in Europe following the conflict were very dull reading after the sensational news of the war itself. It is hard for us here, then, to grasp the difficulties, the problems, and the severe hardships which are even now the common experience of Protestantism on the Continent. Yet a little attention to reports and letters touching the situation must result in arousing the sympathies of true Christians.

In a report called *Protestant Churches of Europe, 1930*, issued by the Central Bureau for Relief of the Evangelical Churches of Europe, we are given some insight into conditions in various places. It is quite clear that many churches are actually struggling for existence. One is led to wonder whether God is permitting a time of trial in preparation for a great spiritual revival and forward movement. These excerpts from the report mentioned need no comment save the reminder that they deal with the situation as it has been within the past twelve months:

"The Protestant Churches in several countries are doing their best to absorb the pastors and religious workers who either fled from Russia or were smuggled out by the help of foreign relief agencies. This is a problem, however, which will adjust itself, in spite of the fact that refugees, singly and in groups, continue to slip over the border.

"The most unfavorable reaction to Russia's 'Five Year Program for the Liquidation of Christianity' is in the impetus it has given the anti-religious element present in the radical sections of the laboring classes. 'Der Proletarier glaubt an

Nichts!" says the German communist. (The proletarian believes in Nothing!) And the echo can be heard in every European tongue. Soviet propaganda is skillful, widespread, unsparing of expense—even to putting up powerful radio stations along the western border in order to drown out the stations of other nationals. Many local governments, especially in Austria and Germany, are strongly Socialistic, and wherever they can do so, pressure is brought to bear on religious institutions, schools, the press and even on employees of the government and of industrial enterprises. To enumerate the instances of petty chicane practiced against the deaconess work alone would give a lengthy list. European Protestantism is not unduly alarmed, but recognizes that the situation is a serious one."

"Protestantism in Austria is a minority religion. Since the war there is not much difficulty with the national government, but a good deal of pressure is brought to bear by employers of labor, directly or indirectly, and on the other hand is the growing radicalism of the industrial workers. The whole economic outlook is pessimistic. It is all the more important to strengthen this small Protestant nucleus which has stubbornly maintained itself in hostile surroundings, for centuries."

"The financial and political situation [in Germany] is still very difficult; it will be years before the Churches can do more than live from hand to mouth; the burden of debt is staggering. A most disturbing factor is the increasingly anti-religious attitude of local governments where socialistic and communistic influence is strong. They regard the Church as part and parcel of the capitalistic system, and they feel that that system has failed if it cannot reduce the present unemployment problem."

ONE OF THE MOST REMARKABLE LIVING CHARACTERS IN JAPAN is Toyohiko Kagawa, whose fame as an evangelist, writer, lecturer, political economist, and friend of the poor, has spread throughout the religious world. Though described as a man of delicate constitution and weak eyes his capacity for work is as astonishing as the variety of his interests is extensive. His chief objective now is the conversion to Christianity of a million of his fellow citizens.

In an account of his life, by E. Eales in a recent issue of *The Contemporary Review*, we learn that Mr. Kagawa was

born in 1888, and that he was early converted to Christianity as the result of his membership in a Bible class to which he had been sent in order to learn English. After a graphic sketch of this amazing man Mr. Eales says of his present religious activities:

"In spite of his political and literary success, Toyohiko Kagawa never loses sight of his belief in a practical Christianity. In 1921 he founded a little society called 'Friends of Jesus,' defined by himself as Franciscan by the spirit of poverty, Jesuit by its loyalty to the Church, and Protestant by its creed. The members undergo a novitiate of three years, and during that time they promise to study the Bible, the *Imitation of Christ*, the *Pilgrim's Progress*, and the history of the persecutions of the Christians in Japan. From fourteen members, the membership has grown to 1,300, who, in their respective towns, meet for worship at six a.m. on Sunday mornings, and then attend regularly the service of the particular church to which they belong. It was before an assembly of this society in 1926 that Kagawa exposed his most cherished dream: never to rest until there are at least a million Japanese converted to practical Christianity, and living the precepts of its Founder. When remonstrated with upon the magnitude of the figure aimed at, Toyohiko replied simply: 'There are twenty-seven million Japanese frequenting houses of ill-fame annually, is it an exaggeration to aim at *one* million of clean-living people?' In any case, it seems but reasonable to try to spread ideal Christianity among the lower classes of Japan, seeing that hitherto the greater number of native Christians are recruited from the intellectual and middle classes, and that the mass of peasants, fishermen, miners, and working men remain utterly indifferent to its doctrines, and fall an easy prey to that form of Communism whose motto is 'What's yours is mine, and what's mine is my own.' To gain even one million out of these forty million more or less poverty-stricken folk to that Communism which says 'What is mine is thine,' would surely be a triumph for brotherly love and true Socialism."

ONE OF THE HARDEST THINGS IN LIFE IS TO BE RECONCILED TO the inevitable decline of powers which precedes its close. There is a sort of humiliation about the fact that one's former ability to accomplish this or that task with noteworthy suc-

ness is gone and cannot be summoned again. We pity the old athlete who refuses to accept the fact that, at forty, he cannot perform some feat that won him applause at twenty, but who still insists on trying, only to be far outstripped by some youngster. Men in every walk of life sometimes find themselves in awkward situations because they refuse the caution of Father Time. But age does not of necessity mean that a man is useless, but rather that he must adapt the nature of his activities to his strength.

One man whom many of us always associate with overflowing vitality and good spirits, and who sets an example for "retired" men, is Frank W. Ober, sometime editor of *Association Men*, and widely known in the Young Men's Christian Association. His retirement has in no way broken his courage or joy in life, as he recently showed when George A. Sanford, a former active Association secretary, asked him, "What about the 'dead-line' for service?" Mr. Ober's answer is given in an account of the interview published in *The Bible To-Day*:

"There is no dead-line for a live man. A man is dead when he is dead. In past days a man of forty wore long whiskers and pottered about with a gold-headed cane, but that day has gone, along with grandma's lace cap, long skirts and the chimney corner. The man of sixty, seventy or even eighty to-day is clean shaven, walks with a stride and asks no odds. He feels insulted should a youth offer him a seat in the subway—if such a thing should happen. However, a man should not fool himself that he is able to do such a day's work at sixty or seventy as in his prime. We all have to face declining powers with declining years and adapt ourselves to conditions 'as is.' . . . When floundering around after my retirement I fell in with former secretarial friends engaged in Near East Relief Work. I became interested in one special department. As I had been a farmer in my youth, naturally I was attracted to bettering agricultural conditions. I have been able to send on bulls, sheep, swine, chickens, etc., of choice breeds to improve stock, also utensils and implements. Think of it, to-day nine out of ten farmers in the Near East plow with a crooked stick, as was done in Abraham's day! For this work the Near East Relief would not be justified in employing a salaried man. I

could live upon my retirement allowance and was happy in finding a field to engage my heart and interest."

ONE OF THE GREATEST OBSTACLES TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF character and even to success is the disposition toward conventionality. Now the fanatic and the egotist are often marked by unconventional habits; but in the former case it results from an obsession, and in the latter from a morbid desire for attention. The average person is so inclined to shun anything that would make him conspicuous that he readily adopts the protective coloring of conventional views, conventional expressions, conventional language, conventional habits, and even conventional dress.

Now much of all this is ordinarily harmless; but it is harmful if it breeds in one such a dread of adverse attention as to make him fail in his duty when it means rowing against the popular current. *The Churchman* not long since, in the course of an editorial called *Daily Exercise in Queerness*, made this plea for self-discipline in this matter:

"We have just heard of a clergyman who takes frequent exercise in learning to disregard conventional opinion. He believes that the task of the minister is to help turn the world upside down, and that his chief peril is conformity. So he deliberately practices being 'different.' Years before it was the fashion, he gave up wearing a hat, which, of course, is excellent for the preservation of the hair. On these hot days he often appears on the city streets in shorts, and is gratified at his increasing ability to smile cheerfully at the scoffing of the mob-mind, knowing that in their hearts they recognize his superior comfort and good sense.

"When a friend expresses surprise that a clergyman, of all people, should make a spectacle of himself, he replies that it is just the clergyman who should have been doing this through the ages. The prophets have always been queer, wearing camel's hair, eating locusts, going naked and barefoot for three years, naming the baby 'Maher-shalal-hash-baz,' wearing a yoke, throwing furniture down the church steps, preaching to birds, carrying a banner of protest down Fifth Avenue. The public ought to be certain that whatever else the priest may do,

he will not be with the crowd, sharing their habits of thought and action."

SOME ATTENTION WAS GIVEN IN THESE PAGES LAST YEAR TO THE appalling menace of the growing traffic in narcotic drugs. The country at large does not seem to have grasped the serious character of this more recent enemy to society, though it is already a strong factor in crime. Every practical effort that is made to awaken the public to the situation should have the encouragement of Christian citizens. A dispatch from Geneva to *The New York Times* lately stated that a report from the Austrian police received by the opium section of the League of Nations showed the determined effort made to deluge this country with these drugs, far more dangerous than alcoholic drinks. The above paper gives these extracts from the report mentioned:

"One fact, however, there is no denying, and that is that the illicit traffic in narcotics puts the regular traffic quite in the shade. In the light of documents such as these, the alkaloid [narcotics] industry would appear to be working solely for the illicit traffic, and this applies to whether the firm has a world-wide reputation or whether its products have not enjoyed any special repute in the circles concerned.

"All the big cases of smuggling with which the narcotics branch of the Austrian Police Headquarters had to deal in recent years pointed eastward. All could be traced at least as far as Turkey or Egypt, and in most cases further still to Shanghai, Japan and ultimately America. The United States is the final goal of the big consignments of narcotics. All the big European alkaloid factories appear to be working for that country."

BOOKS

THE PRESENT CRISIS IN RELIGION ¹

IT IS A GREAT PLEASURE to call attention to a book like *The Present Crisis in Religion*. The author is aware of the seriousness of the theme he is discussing, and he approaches it in a scientific and scholarly way. The book is an apologetic, not for the things for which religion stands, but for the church which is the organ of Christianity. In this country Dr. Orchard is known better by his published prayers than in any other way. In England he is a leader of the ritualistic wing of the church, although he is a dissenter. He is committed to a belief in the importance of the esthetic element in worship. But his four-volume book on *The Foundations of Faith* has given him a place among the leading scholars of today.

In the opinion of many religious leaders there is no present crisis. They think of the diminished church attendance and the lack of interest in religious education as a change incident to new views of life. To a Modernist the changed attitude toward religion is a symptom of growth and progress. To the rigid Premillenarian there are growing evidences that the last days are at hand. It is well, therefore, to have a thoughtful study of religious conditions.

The seven chapters of this volume are entitled: The Present Condition of Religion, The Causes of the Present Crisis, The Issues Critical for Humanity, The Prospects of Recovery, The Reconsideration of Christianity, The Rehabilitation of the Church, and The Revival of Religion. These topics in themselves show a careful analysis of the subject, and indicate the goal toward which the study is directed. The approach to the question is not mere assumption, but is based on careful surveys and statistics.

“ . . . without loading these pages with figures whose

¹ *The Present Crisis in Religion*. By the Rev. W. E. Orchard, D.D. (Lond.). New York: Harper & Brothers. 1929. Pp. x+281.

very significance might only be disputed, it may be taken to be beyond discussion that within the last twenty years there has been a considerable decline in the attendance at public worship. So much is this realized by denominational authorities that a recent proposal for a further census was strongly deprecated on the ground that it would only prove gravely discouraging." (P. 8.)

But what conclusion is to be drawn from such facts?

"The question is what this decline in public worship signifies as an index to the state of religion. From what statistics are available and from general observation, that this decline is serious cannot be doubted; but whether it has an equally serious bearing on the state of religion is disputed." (P. 10 f.)

With these facts established, Dr. Orchard finds it necessary to inquire what they indicate about the state of religion. Of religion outside the church he makes this affirmation:

"While blatant atheism is certainly less evident, there are large areas in modern thought where there is no belief in the existence of anything supernatural or superhuman, and a still vaster area where there is even no interest in such questions as to whether there is anything above humanity or beyond this life" (p. 19).

and this:

"It is to be feared, however, that the faithful remnant hardly corresponds to anything like a well-disciplined, heroic or effective force for commending Christianity to the world, whether by example or exhortation" (p. 22).

All this, and in fact the whole survey of the present condition of religion, is far from reassuring. But is it not better frankly to accept the facts and prepare to deal with the conditions which they represent? "It is difficult not to feel that everywhere we are suffering from a lack of energy and enthusiasm; people are exhausted, depressed or blasé." "If a real recovery is to be made faith must be recovered."

The thesis of the volume is stated in these words:

". . . the present state of religion can only be regarded as inadequate to the religious needs of humanity; for while

these needs are increasing, religion itself, whether in the extent of its observances, the clearness of its convictions, or its capacity for creative expression, is certainly on the decline" (p. 41).

This assertion is not confined to Protestantism, but is applied to religion in general, including Mohammedanism and paganism. The modern scientific point of view has subjected intelligence to a new strain.

"Moreover, the hypothesis of man's slow emergence from an animal ancestry has put upon the story of human rebellion, God's wrath against sin, and the grace of His forgiveness, a very different complexion in many minds" (p. 53).

Again, with much brilliancy and a discerning comprehension, the writer has taken us over the disintegrating influence of the theories of evolution and the developmental theory of revelation. When we endeavor to think either of trained minds or the minds of people of average intelligence trying to reconcile the hypotheses of science and the interpretations of Scripture which have been made without much inspiration, the marvel is that so much of religion remains. The author is well versed in the scientific and theological literature of the last quarter-century, and for those who have not been able to do such work he furnishes an enlightening survey with illuminating comments. Surely religion has suffered at the hand of its teachers. Take a passage like this, upon modern criticism's view of Christ:

"It is difficult to see how the unexpert mind is to make anything of the alternatives that modern criticism has left for it to choose between: a purely humanitarian teacher, an unhistorical myth, a fanatical prophet, a seriously deranged personality; unless it can conclude that these representations not only contradict one another, but cancel each other out, so that, therefore, no one of them is true; when the only conceivable alternative left is that the Gospel picture as a whole can be taken as trustworthy" (p. 207).

Over against that you find this affirmation:

"Christ is, therefore, not a mere revelation of theological facts concerning the existence of God, His nature, and the coherence in Him of a threefold personality; He is given to us

not merely to be, in His divine and human natures, an adorable object of worship, but as a means of redemption by which humanity is to be lifted into union with God" (p. 216).

In a part of his discussion, Dr. Orchard introduces arguments which are difficult to follow, but most of his reasoning is clear and cogent. He writes as one who is master of his subject and has thought through his problems. His style is most attractive. It is always an added pleasure to read such beautiful English. Readers may find it difficult to accept the author's conclusions. He believes in ritualism, and he belongs to the modern mystic school of thought. He makes the following remarks about church unity:

"The unity of the Church in any sufficiently and spiritually effective inclusive sense has yet to be attained; and after, on the one hand, the abortive attempts of the World Conference on Faith and Order, and, on the other, the apparently wholly condemnatory attitude of the recent Papal Encyclical on True Religious Unity; and when it is remembered that the rank and file of most Church members are either not concerned for the unity of the Church or are without any comprehension of the deepseated difficulties and long-entrenched divisions to be overcome; it must be evident that nothing but some great spiritual uprising, occasioned by a clearer conception of the world's need and of Christ's will for the unity of His Church, is essential before we can advance any farther in this direction" (p. 263 f.).

But there are few who will hesitate concerning his conclusion:

"Far more necessary than improved machinery or more effective organization is the need for individuals aflame with earnestness for the conversion of souls and baptized with the Holy Spirit for that purpose. The present personnel of all the Churches, added together, or weeded out by any necessary process, is neither large enough, nor sufficiently equipped for such a task, without some special endowment of the Spirit of God." (P. 264.)

And this statement in regard to prayer is rich in meaning:

"Here is the real cure for the confused mentality, the intellectual difficulties and the depleted spirituality of our

times. Despite all that must remain unknown, and everything that may still prove not wholly satisfying in this present world, there is a way to interior peace, to unshakable conviction, and to a new endowment of power in the practice of prayer as that is defined and can be directed by mystical theory." (P. 273.)

Everyone who is interested in the progress of the church and the problems which confront religious leaders today may find much of value in Dr. Orchard's book.

JAMES PALMER.

THE PLACE OF JESUS CHRIST IN MODERN CHRISTIANITY ²

THIS BOOK consists of eight lectures delivered at Union Theological Seminary, New York, in 1929 under the Ely Foundation. The author is Professor John Baillie, who has since been appointed to succeed Dr. William Adams Brown as Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Seminary. The aim of the book, as stated by the author in his Preface, "is to restate our Christian conviction about our Lord Jesus Christ in a form which shall avoid the many perplexing difficulties inherent in the traditional presentation of it, while yet losing hold of none of the great insights into spiritual truth, which lay embedded within that traditional presentation and were the real secret of its marvellously powerful appeal to the human heart."

Dr. Baillie then is a Modernist, whose aim is laudable in so far as he seeks not to destroy but to fulfill. The question is, Has he succeeded. In the first place he is convinced that in the story of our Lord's Person and work as given in the "gospel tale" we have somehow "the only balm for our soul's woe" (p. 21). He believes that "the spirit of the man Jesus" (p. 19) is active in our social life, our international relations, and in the rediscovery of the power in love and faith. He believes with the author of *The Christ of the Indian Road* that Mahatma Gandhi has "put the cross into politics" (pp. 20,

² *The Place of Jesus Christ in Modern Christianity*. By John Baillie, M.A. (Edin.), D.Litt. (Edin.), Professor of Systematic Theology in Emmanuel College, University of Toronto. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1929. Pp. xiv+219. Index.

168). Unfortunately for Dr. Baillie's argument the use of such general statements without clear definition confuses the issue. Is it true, for instance, that Mahatma Gandhi has put the cross into politics? After all, is there any essential difference in his tactics from those of Mrs. Pankhurst in her fight for woman suffrage? Only in certain external aspects can any similarity with the suffering of Jesus be inferred. The aim is essentially different. Gandhi is striving to free his country from British rule; in the days of our Lord there were men striving to free Judea from Roman rule, and the significant thing is that Jesus refused to have anything to do with them, because His task was the infinitely greater one of redeeming the world from sin. Dr. Baillie himself quotes such hymns as Rock of Ages, O Generous Love, There is a Fountain Filled with Blood (p. 14 f.). Let him ask himself in what intelligible sense such words can be applied to Mahatma Gandhi or to anybody but Jesus, and he will realize that his statements are beclouding the issue, and not illuminating it.

It is in this lack of clarity of thinking that the chief defect in Dr. Baillie's method of reinterpretation is to be found. What he virtually does is to raise a smoke screen, from which he tries to emerge triumphantly holding aloft the Gospel in his hand, but leaving the source of the power of the Gospel in vague confusion behind him. An analysis of chapter iii, The Christian Fellowship, will make this fact clear. He takes as his point of departure for argument the meetings of the little band of disciples after Pentecost. What was there about these meetings in the upstairs room "that had in it the secret of such tremendous spiritual power, making them the starting point of the greatest religious movement the world has ever seen?" (P. 39.) No fault can be found with the starting point of investigation nor with the statement of the problem. It is also right to enquire into the nature of the experience of the first disciples. Dr. Baillie affirms that its specific and distinguishing characteristic was *koinonia*, or "fellowship." The disciples found themselves standing in a new relationship to

God and to each other. What was this new relationship? The answer, he says, may be given in a single word, *agape*, or Christian love; it was a fellowship of *agape*. Here Dr. Baillie enters into a valuable discussion of the meaning of *agape*, maintaining that essentially it is redemptive in character (p. 45), and therefore it must be also a suffering love. In the suffering there is also joy, for "From the beginning Christianity was a religion of triumphant hope, a 'resurrection faith,' a faith rooted in the conviction that love was stronger than death, and could not be holden of death, but must rise from death to life eternal" (p. 47). Unfortunately these words of Dr. Baillie are capable of more than one interpretation. The crucial question is, Where did the little band get their faith? The author seems to cling to Harnack's view of an Easter faith without an Easter message; but, if the story in the New Testament means anything, it makes clear beyond any doubt that the little band which met in the upper room based their faith on a historical incident, and without the acceptance of that incident we can only say that their faith and suffering love were sublime delusion. Instead of discussing this crucial issue Professor Baillie proceeds to analyze the relationship of *agape* to fatherhood and sonship as elements in the fellowship between God and the believer.

Even in the following chapter, Christ the Founder, we have no satisfactory dealing with the issue. Jesus was the founder in the sense that He was "the Pioneer of the Christian 'Way'" (p. 60). Without going into detail we can only repeat that Dr. Baillie's method is that of obscuring the essential issue and, in the resultant confusion of thought, trying to persuade his readers that he has preserved the fundamentals of the old faith. There is nothing in this book to alter the impression produced by Dr. Baillie's former book, *The Interpretation of Religion*, that he is a mystical Unitarian. There is much in his present work that is finely put, and it is unquestionably the work of a scholar; but, when we come to the vital question raised by the title, What is the place of Jesus Christ in

modern Christianity? we cannot say that the author has added anything of value to the solution. Indeed, he fails to grapple with the central issue. If Dr. Baillie will read again the narratives in Acts regarding the Gospel message from those of the upper room, he will find that, although it was true they met in the fellowship of *agape*, the message they delivered drew attention not to *agape*, but to the fulfillment of prophecy in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. No inquiry into the meaning of Jesus can be adequate which ignores this element in their message. Dr. Baillie acknowledges the leadership of Schleiermacher in his method of interpretation (p. 30), but that great theologian was too accurate a thinker to ignore the relationship of Christianity to a philosophy of history. Schleiermacher was a mystic, but in all cases he strove to correct tendencies to error by exact observation and analysis.

The revival of teleology in modern scientific philosophy is of the first importance for the theologian and the philosopher in the interpretation of history. The early disciples interpreted the death of Jesus teleologically, saying that it was part of the great divine purpose from all eternity, and that this purpose was essentially one of redemption. The realization of this fact gave rise to the faith, joy, and love in their Gospel, and any account of the place of Jesus in history, ancient or modern, which ignores this, however interesting and illuminative it may be in parts, must be regarded as inadequate.

And so, while we appreciate many things Dr. Baillie has said, we cannot feel he has made any real contribution to the subject with which he deals.

ANDREW R. OSBORN.

THE SUPREME BOOK OF MANKIND³

THIS BOOK, *The Supreme Book of Mankind*, is one which will be welcomed by those who have a deep love for the Scriptures. Its appearance is especially timely when considered in relation

³ *The Supreme Book of Mankind*. The Origin and Influence of the English Bible. The Bross Lectures, 1929. By James G. K. McClure, D.D., LL.D., President of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, 1905-1928. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1930. Pp. 227. Index.

to the many efforts being made to increase interest in the Bible.

The present volume is No. XIV in the Bross Library. This series has included such noteworthy books as *The Problem of the Old Testament*, by James Orr; *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, by Douglas Clyde Macintosh; *The Will to Freedom*, by John Neville Figgis; and others. *The Supreme Book of Mankind* comes from one who needs no introduction to readers of religious literature and from one whose ability as a leader and scholar is attested by his long period of service as President of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, of which he is now President-emeritus.

The content of this book is better suggested by its subtitle, *The Origin and Influence of the English Bible*, or by the original title of the lectures, *England's First Library*. The treatment of the subject is divided into six chapters. The first two tell the story of the coming of the Bible to the English and their conversion by means of it. In its clear, lucid style it is a fascinating account from the very beginning.

It is a remarkable fact, as the author points out, that when England is measured by itself alone, its surface becomes less than one-half of one four hundred and twenty-third part of the land surface of the globe (p. 3). "However, to-day England controls nearly one-fourth of the earth's area. The sun never sets upon her dominions, for they belt the entire globe. Nor is her influence confined within her own territories, for she has given her language, not alone to her own populations, but also to millions upon millions of peoples who are entirely independent of her governmental control, peoples markedly forceful and aggressive." (P. 4.)

Then it is that the writer raises the question, the answer to which is the thesis of his book: "Here then is a very remarkable fact—that a small part of the vast earth exerts so widespread and so dominant an influence all over the globe—remarkable especially when we bear in mind the kind of people the original inhabitants were who gave their name to England. Can this fact be explained?" (P. 5.)

The entire book should be read; for as the publisher informs us in the jacket introduction, Dr. McClure "has not given a cut-and-dried account, but has collected material of a varied character, and has called witnesses not of a common sort. There is much that will be new to any one who sees these pages."

In the first library brought to the shores of England there were just nine books, all of which were Biblical (p. 8). "Of all books penned by man and held in man's hand, these books are destined to play the largest part, the most determining part books have ever played in human life, a part that is so clear that it can be distinctly traced" (p. 9). This "part" the author proceeds to trace in the chapter on the conversion of the English, and the four following, respectively on the Bible in the education, the literature, the missions, and the general life of the English speaking world.

Every person who prides himself in his Anglo-Saxon blood ought to read the story of the conversion of his ancestors on those islands. That pride may still remain, but the heart will feel humble before God and will well up with gratitude toward those heroic missionaries who preached His Word faithfully among a noble and gallant people. Many fascinating incidents connected with such names as Gregory the Great, Augustine the missionary, King Ethelbert and his wife Bertha, their daughter Ethelwyn and her husband Edwin, Caedmon the singer and poet, Cuthbert, and others abound in this book. From beginning to end the teacher and preacher will find it rich in facts and illustrative material of intense human interest.

This review does not afford space for a detailed consideration of these chapters. In fact, such would be in direct opposition to its purpose. Educators in general will be interested in the "Unknown Teacher" who started the English race upon its intellectual life. Such characters as Columba of Iona, the Venerable Bede, Alcuin, Alfred, and others become as friends to the reader of these pages. Oxford and Cambridge are also a part of this story.

The testimony of English literature to the Bible is the

subject of chapter iv. It is the story of a people that had never seen a book of any kind until the Bible came, and yet of a land that will always be remembered for its Wyclif, Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Bunyan, Scott, and a long list of others (p. 109 f.).

The chapter on the Bible and missions needs to be read to be fully appreciated. One wonders if many missionary problems facing the church today would not be eliminated if its members were acquainted with this triumphant story. "Yes, the sea-wolves have changed their very nature and a marvellous transformation has taken place, for a race that stood for rapacity, cruelty, untamableness, and destruction has become the lover and the saviour of the world, and all by reason of the Bible" (p. 179).

The concluding chapter touches such topics as the influence of the Bible on laws, statesmanship, cathedrals, music, art, science, medicine, reform movements, charitable institutions, and on life in general. It carries a practical challenge to teachers, ministers, students, parents, statesmen, and to all, that this Book be kept "in our homes, our schools, our literature. We must know it and its message. Our children must know it. Our legislators must know it. Our merchants must know it. For if the Bible should cease to function in our ideals for the family, the school, the press room and the state, a process of disintegration would be inevitable that must eventually destroy our own vitality." (P. 214 f.)

DEAN G. McKEE.

DAN CRAWFORD ⁴

THIS ADMIRABLE BIOGRAPHY will do much toward giving to Dan Crawford his rightful place in the forefront of missionary pioneers. Among its various good qualities is its unfailing

⁴*Dan Crawford*. Missionary and Pioneer in Central Africa. By Dr. G. E. Tilsley, Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society, Fellow of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. With Foreword by Dr. Laws of Livingstonia. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1929. Pp. xx+609. Index. Maps. Illustrations.

clarity. With all its mass of details, with its voluminous quotations, and its array of unfamiliar names, it nevertheless is so carefully outlined, its material is so skillfully arranged, its maps and illustrations are so helpful, that the reader is never bewildered. The career of the hero is distinctly traced, his character is fully revealed, and his achievements are plainly set forth.

Such an interpretation of the life of Dan Crawford was needed even by his best friends. He had not always made himself understood. His writings were numerous, colorful, original, unique, but not easily interpreted. Even persons who had read his *Thinking Black*, who had met him during his stay in America, and who were fascinated by his frequent letters from Africa were somewhat at a loss to know just who he was and where he was at work and what he had done. The author of this biography was admirably prepared for his task. He was a nephew and a companion of the intrepid missionary, a Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society, and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, himself a missionary who had traveled widely among the tribes for whom Dan Crawford gave his life and who had been furnished with all the materials needed for the construction of his illuminating and valuable narrative.

In large measure he allows the hero to tell his own story, for his extracts from journals and letters are continuous and generous; yet they are always accompanied by explanatory statements and by concise maps, and are so introduced that the reader never misses the thread of the narrative nor finds himself lost in the details of the story. He makes perfectly plain the reason why Dan Crawford was somewhat obscure in his writings in spite of his surprising mastery of language and his vivid word pictures. It was because he was literally "thinking black." So thoroughly had he come to know the dark-skinned Bantu tribes of the Upper Congo that he was following their mental processes and adopting their forms of expres-

sion. He perfectly understood the people among whom he was working, and he was understood by them.

As he begins his story the writer gives an explanation also of the peculiar and characteristic views of his uncle, both as to Christian doctrine and as to methods of work. It was under the influence of the Plymouth Brethren that the Scotch "laddie" at the age of sixteen experienced conversion and dedicated his life to missionary service. He was inspired with a love for the Bible and a passion for bringing individual souls into fellowship with Christ; but he was not concerned with the organized church or with institutional forms of Christian activity.

Dan Crawford was always an individualist. In this lay his weakness, but also his strength and the secret of his unique career. Without the backing of any missionary society, with no assured financial support, with the most meager equipment, he started with a few companions for the heart of Africa. He had been prepared by no course of study in college or seminary, his life was threatened by incipient consumption, he knew little or nothing of the character of the tribes he was to encounter or of the languages they spoke. Landing at Benguela, on the West Coast, some twelve degrees below the equator, he is soon seen pressing on into the interior, absolutely alone, encountering incredible hardships and perils, until after more than a year of struggle he finds himself a practical prisoner at the capital of Mushidi, a pagan prince who ruled as tyrant over a vast empire in Central Africa.

The first period covered by the biography is that of the nineteen years in Britain, the second that of the journey from the coast to Mushidi's capital, the third that of his four hundred and four days with Mushidi. The fourth period is that of exploration, particularly around Lake Mweru on the west shore of which he ultimately establishes Luanza, the scene, or the radiating center, of his life work. This lake lies south and west of Lake Tanganyika, and northwest of Lake Nyasa, and the adventurer found that the best route to reach his isolated station was from the East Coast through Livingstonia. Indeed

he was able to forge the link of communication between the route of Livingstone towards the east and the stations of Arnot leading across the continent to the West Coast.

For seventeen years longer, from 1894 to 1911, with no furlough, with infrequent communication with civilized lands, Dan Crawford continued his witness for Christ in a region of darkest paganism. This constitutes the "Fifth Period" of his career. Reinforcements begin to arrive; the tide of isolation turns. His life is immeasurably enriched by his marriage in 1896 to Grace Tilsley, whom he had not seen since their first meeting in England more than seven years before, and who came on the long journey to meet her future husband in the heart of Africa. The following years are filled with itineration among the tribes, with the establishment of churches and Bible schools, and supremely with the translation into Luba of the entire Bible. Dan Crawford was an extraordinary linguist, his ability to acquire and master languages and dialects was almost incredible, and his translation of the Scriptures will long remain as an impressive monument of his tireless labors in the Dark Continent.

His only furlough in thirty-seven years was taken between 1911 and 1915. He then made an extended visit to Great Britain, where he wrote *Thinking Black*; subsequently he visited America, Australia, and South Africa. This furlough constituted the "Sixth Period" of his life.

In the later years, which his biographer describes as the "Seventh Period: 1915-1925," great changes occurred in the region of Luanza, caused by the impact of civilization. His work was more liberally supported, existence was relieved of many of its hardships, fellow workers aided in the great task, more time was found for study and for writing, and the number of converts rapidly increased so that the pioneer missionary before his death found himself surrounded by a large Christian community and was wielding over vast areas an influence which still abides.

CHARLES R. ERDMAN.

FOURSQUARE⁵

THIS LIFE STORY is one of the most remarkable that has come to the reviewer's attention. The eminence to which the writer has attained in any one of his professions would have satisfied most aspiring souls, but it does not seem to have been sufficient to bring contentment to the spirit of Dr. Oliver. For he not only carries on in all fields today, but has thrown in for good measure the mastering of Greek for a pastime. He informs us that he never goes to sleep at night without reading three or four hundred lines of Homer in the original for a nightcap.

The unique feature in this life story is the way in which Dr. Oliver's religious nature would not allow him to be satisfied with anything else in the world but his lost priesthood restored. So, after twenty-five years of achievement in other lines, he wins his lifelong struggle to gain back the precious prize which he threw away so thoughtlessly in his young manhood; and he is restored to his altar. The vital interest of the book comes to its climax with the recording of the details of this religious struggle. And it is this experience which has given to all his other activities their unique tone.

When his first book, *Fear*, appeared it was given to this reviewer to handle. At that time the author was unknown to the general public. There was, however, something so unusual in the combination of psychiatry and religion in this story that, before we were willing to make any pronouncement upon the author's psychological method of handling his patient, we wrote to a leading physician in Baltimore to see if he could throw any light upon this psychiatrist's peculiar use of religion in his treatment of his patient. Had the information contained in this book been in our hands we would have understood. And so also the story in his second book, *Victor and Victim*, becomes better understood; for it is his own life struggle vaguely disguised as fiction. The title *Foursquare* would be better Fourfold, for Dr. Oliver is a bachelor, and has never rounded out

⁵ *Foursquare*. The Story of a Fourfold Life. By John Rathbone Oliver. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. x+305.

his life to square the circle by accepting his full social and racial responsibility in the marriage relation. But for this there is a reason.

From a child he was a very religious boy, born into a religious home where bishops and deans were frequent guests. Early in his educational career he decides to become a minister. So, after graduating from Harvard, he enters General Theological Seminary, in New York, to study for the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church. During two years in Europe, before entering the University, he was brought much in contact with Roman Catholicism and was deeply impressed by many of its cathedrals and their elaborate services. He spent Holy Week in Rome, so that he was able to hear Pope Leo XIII say Easter Mass in the Sistine Chapel, and was urged by influential friends to become a Roman Catholic and begin his study with them. He tells us that he wanted to say yes, but resisted, returning home to continue his education here. He was ordained a priest in the Episcopal Church and immediately began his work.

During the second year of his priesthood he felt a very strong urge to give his life to a religious order. Decided to do so, he made application for admission to a famous order, or society, in England and was accepted. He was given six months to make his final preparations to leave his family, America, and the world. All parish duties were given up, and he had his time to use as he pleased. Fully conscious that he was saying farewell to the world and its life, he took a few last tastes of its pleasures and joys, and before the six months were over he had come to the conclusion that it was too good to leave. So he withdrew his application for admission to the order and returned to the church in this country. This experience is not stressed in the book, but it is very important to the one who would understand the psychological forces that here began to work in his life. The next part of the story, written in the third person, reads as follows:

"Having let people know about his change of plans and having been complimented by a majority on having 'become

sensible,' he looked around for something to do. And he found it soon enough. He found a very delightful position, in a big parish, where he had extremely comfortable quarters, very light duties, a horse to ride, practically no poor to visit, but a great many delightful parishioners who wanted him to visit them to lunch and to dine, to eat and to drink." (P. 271.)

The next paragraph gives us a little more information as to what happened:

"Now, in a rich and pleasure-loving community, a priest may lead a restrained and holy life and yet at the same time keep in touch with those to whom he is called to minister. The possibility of such a life was daily before our young man's eyes: for the rector, who went everywhere and who was beloved of every one, maintained untouched his own priestly ideals. Our young ecclesiastic, however, lost his. He was not conscious of this. On the contrary, he thought that he had freed himself from a lot of unnecessary prejudices: he imagined that he was 'getting at his people' by accepting the material standards of their lives." (P. 271 f.)

One more passage will bring this part of the story to its conclusion:

"Our young man became very well pleased with life. He was enjoying himself. And he spent more time in lay clothes than in a round collar. Disaster of some kind was inevitable. The men and the women with whom he 'played around' had, in spite of their apparently thoughtless lives, ideals and standards of their own. They might live on a low spiritual plane: but it was 'their plane,' and they did not intend to fall below it, even though they might have little or no desire to rise above it. But our young man, in losing his priestly ideals, had lost all his standards. He had fallen from a high plane to a lower one: and now he had nothing in the world to keep him from dropping still further. Yet he was satisfied, perfectly so. Had he not cast off all sorts of silly bondages, and was he not now a free man?" (P. 272 f.)

This drop into loose living costs him his priestly office and his ministry. He is unfrocked. To get away from the disgrace he goes abroad. While there he makes the acquaintance of a number of ex-priests who have traveled the same road and

who have found the priesthood of the Roman Catholic Church a way to return. They urge him to enter this communion and take orders in it. So he becomes a Roman Catholic and goes to the theological school for preparation. When the time is set for his ordination some American bishop enters a protest, and he is stopped.

This happened again and again, until at last he realized that he could not gain his priestly office even in the Roman Church. So he decided to become a physician. And this explains how he became John Rathbone Oliver, M.D. After completing his medical studies abroad, receiving his degree, and serving in the Austrian army during the first years of the war, he returned to America and went to Baltimore to live. Here he soon found a job in a psychiatric clinic. He became the consulting psychologist for the Criminal Court, then he opened his own office and practiced psychiatry, then became warden of Alumni Hall of Johns Hopkins University, then professor of the History of Medicine in the University of Maryland, then, after twenty-five years, a restored priest and minister, and then a successful writer. In every field he is still carrying on.

The story of this fourfold life is told by a gifted writer, one who knows it, because it is his own life-story. His attachment to the Catholic faith makes him quite incapable of understanding Protestantism, against which he raves with the only touch of harshness in the book.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

THE HOLY KABBALAH⁶

A BULKY VOLUME of striking appearance, *The Holy Kabbalah*, with striking illustrations, prefaced by a not less striking declaration on the title page: "A Study of the Secret Tradition in Israel—as unfolded by Sons of the Doctrine for the Benefit and Consolation of the Elect dispersed through the Lands and Ages of The Greater Exile." The words form a

⁶ *The Holy Kabbalah*. A Study of the Secret Tradition in Israel. By A. E. Waite. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1929. Pp. xxvi+636. Index. Illustrations.

part of the title and their strange arrangement is doubtless in imitation of the famous *Abracadabra*, but in this case the only apparent reason for it is to impress the reader. Before taking up this book it may be well to give a brief account of the Kabbalistic system.

Mr. Waite himself states that "the Kabbalah is a form of Esoteric Philosophy," and that "the literature called Kabbalistic rose up among the Jews during the Christian centuries which succeeded their dispersal and the destruction of their Holy City. . . . It is responsible in its degeneration for all that strange tissue of symbolism and procedure which made up the Ceremonial and Philosophical Magic of the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries; at a comparatively late period it entered into the story of Alchemy; it tintured many of those conventional practices and beliefs which are called superstitious in our loose fashion of words, and the guise in which we know them is very often a Kabbalistic guise. Were it possible to suppose for a moment that behind Magic, behind Alchemy and Astrology there were any mystery of real knowledge, then it would be entitled to peculiar respect. . . ." (Preface, p. v.)

Isaac Meyer probably gives the shortest interpretation of the Kabbalistic system which may be found. He says:

"*Ain Soph*, the Unknowable and Absolute, manifests through the efflux of the spiritual and material universe, using the ten *Sephiroth* (emanations) as its media. The first emanation symbolizes Abstract Thought, the Absolute assuming consciousness to manifest outwardly. The second emanation represents the association of abstract ideas in the intellect, which association is Wisdom. The third emanation is Mind, receiving the impression of the abstract ideas. These three constitute the *Spirit of the World*.

"The second triad of *Sephiroth*, Mercy, Judgment and Beauty, includes the principles of construction and symbolizes the abstract dimensions of matter, length, breadth, depth and their double polarity. *Chesed* and *Geburah* are the centripetal and centrifugal energies between the poles of the dimensions.

In their junction with *Tiphereth* they represent all ethical life and perfection. They correspond to the *Soul of the World*.

"The third triad is dynamic; its *Sephiroth* signifies the Deity as universal potentiality, energy and productive principle. They answer to the idea of Nature; the *natura naturans*, however, and not the *natura naturata*.

"The tenth *Sephirah*, or *Malkuth*, represents the *Concrete*, and is the energy and executive power of the Abstract Intellect." (*Philosophy of Ibn Gebirol*, XIII.)

To this brief exposition we may add a few words giving some ideas as to the cosmological system of the Kabbalah. The Kabbalistic books use the term creation in a very different sense from that in Christian cosmology, because that which they called Nothing evasively was the plentitude in which the All lay latent. The world of *Beriah* (creation) was not that in which anything material was formed, emanated, or otherwise brought into actual being, but it was rather the Elohistic world (that of panurgic force and intelligence) which became formative in *Yetzirah* (formation) but did not produce matter except in the Fourth World, *Assiah* (the world of the four elements). Now the materials, or rather the instruments, the matrices, of the material world were nothing but *the letters of the Hebrew alphabet*! According to the *Sefer Yetzirah*, God imparted them form and weight by combining and transforming them in divers manners. By hundreds of permutations these letters are the origin, not only of all languages, but also of all creatures. And as these permutations can also be reduced to a single Name (by a later hypothesis), that is, the Tetragrammaton IHVH (Jehovah or Jaweh). So it is said that the entire universe proceeds from this Name. And thus the Name in its realization, understood in the heart and mind, gives all knowledge according to the Kabbalists. Eliphas Lévi, for instance, reduces all the doctrine to the axiom: "All knowledge is in a word, all power in a name; the intelligence of this name is the Science of Abraham and Solomon." (*Cf. Clefs Majeures*, Paris, 1895.) The warrant of this hypothesis, however, is to

be sought in the Talmudic system itself, which held that the body of the sacred text was divine like the sense which was its soul. Now, the letters of the alphabet are the materials of the textual body, and for the mystical Jew, who discerned strange abysses of mystery in the smallest peculiarities of the *Torah*, there was a weird fascination in the fact that all the wonders of the Law and the Prophets resulted from the diverse combination of twenty-two letters. He also came to regard this handful of conventional hieroglyphs as so many sacraments by which divine wisdom was communicated to man.

The design of the book, as expressed by the author in a statement on the jacket, is to give "A comprehensive account of the Kabbalah, on the surface expository and historical, but seeking to establish its connections with other forms of alleged Secret Tradition, to determine its influence and importance, and to show forth its contribution to the sacred science of the soul." (Cf. also Preface, p. vi.) He also tells us in the same place: "This work has been written by a Christian Mystic and chiefly for the use of Mystics. It is not even addressed—primarily at least—to members of the religion of Israel." Yet this avowed "Christian Mystic" ends his own statement with the declaration that, "from its nature the foundation of Mysticism cannot be *in so-called occult science or in occult philosophy.*" (Italics are the reviewer's.)

In other words, Mr. Waite declares, practically, that there is no value for mysticism in the Kabbalah at all. What is in fact the Kabbalah, whether true or false, if not a system of occult science or occult philosophy? Indeed Mr. Waite himself seems aware of this when he says:

"If I have had in the course of the inquiry to reduce *various illusions* to their proper place *in the realm of the fantastic*, and have contracted the sphere of what is called Mysticism within its proper dimensions, I shall be justified, so far as regards my intention, *by those whom I have sought to disabuse*" (p. xiii. Italics are the reviewer's).

According to this declaration there seem to be two kinds of mystics for whom Mr. Waite professes to write: First,

those who have "various illusions" about the value of the Kabbalah. These he feels justified in "seeking to disabuse." Second, those (himself included) who are persuaded that "from its nature the foundation of Mysticism cannot be in so-called occult science or in occult philosophy."

Evidently, therefore, the members of this latter group would not receive any peculiar benefit from a long exposition of the Kabbalah, which, at its best, they believe has no value for their mysticism at all, as Mr. Waite himself declares. As to the members of the first group, however, Mr. Waite feels called to "disabuse" them and to reduce their various illusions "in the realm of the fantastic." Yet it is evident that even such mystics must have been well conversant, in a sense, with Kabbalism and its teachings. In fact, without such knowledge, how could they have formed their "various illusions" about the Kabbalah, which Mr. Waite feels called to dispel? This being the case, we cannot understand the necessity of writing a bulky volume of nearly 700 pages in order to demonstrate chiefly to mystics the "influence and importance" of a system which, according to the author's own declaration, cannot have any value for their own mysticism.

The present reviewer has had some acquaintance, dating back a number of years, with Kabbalistic writings in their original languages, as well as in the Latin and other tongues. As a consequence he was driven to the same conclusions as Mr. Waite as to the futility of the system, and he also found out that all serious-minded scholars, both in Christianity and in Judaism, had been compelled to reach the same verdict. So he was quite surprised when the ponderous volume under review was brought to his attention, and it was with eager anticipation he began its perusal, hoping to discover in it something original or valuable from the point of view of the age in which we live; but his expectations have not been fulfilled.

The exhibition of the system, "on the surface expository and historical," as Mr. Waite declares, does not provide much which may not be found in the standard works on Kabbalism

or the articles in encyclopedias bearing on the subject. This also may be said of the Kabbalistic charts and other illustrations which may appear quite original to those who see them for the first time. Yet we were surprised to find out that Mr. Waite seems to ignore entirely the valuable labors of Archdeacon Charles of Westminster, who has shown that one thousand years before the *Sefer Yetzirah* a cosmology based upon the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet was already in existence. Dr. Charles also shows that the apocalyptic literature of the second and first centuries B.C. contain all the chief elements of the later Kabbalah and that the early writers are, indeed, more systematic and fuller than the later ones. (Cf. Introduction to the *Book of Jubilees*.)

As to questions regarding authorship and date of the two principal documents of the Kabbalah, the *Sepher Yetzirah*, or Book of Formation, and the *Sepher Ha Zohar*, or Book of Splendor, after giving the traditional views on both sides of the question, Mr. Waite leaves the whole problem exactly as it was before.

The volume may be classified as a pretty full manual of the Jewish Kabbalah, containing as clear an exposition of its doctrines as may be understood by the general reader; but our question is, Was it worth while? This is what puzzles us, more especially when we consider certain statements by Mr. Waite himself on this very point. He says, for instance, that "The cosmology of *Sepher Yetzirah*, with its development in the *Zohar*, belongs however to more purely fantastic aspects of Kabbalistic dream" (Appendix III, p. 612). But since these two books are those which he regards as the principal sources of the Kabbalah, apart from any questions of date or authorship, and since they are full of such "purely fantastic dreams," anyone may draw his own conclusions as to the value of such a work as this.

Long ago St. Jerome, in his *Prologus Galeatus*, when contrasting the clearness and the simplicity of the canonical books of the Old Testament with the uninspired Jewish writings of his

time, called the latters' legends *Apocryphorum deliramenta*, "ravings of the Apocrypha." Those of the Kabbalists would also rouse his righteous indignation; and if so, why awake them from their dust?

AGIDE PIRAZZINI.

WORD PICTURES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT ⁷

THERE ARE PROLIFIC WRITERS, and there are prolific scholars. The former often invite the charge of superficiality because they attempt to cover too wide a range of subjects—to be on the order of ready commentators on important matters generally, while being authorities on nothing. But when one turns to an author of many works on one subject he feels that here is a man so steeped in the matter he deals with that he may be followed with confidence. And it is with some such impression that a student of the New Testament picks up a book by Dr. A. T. Robertson. Opposite the title page of the work under review, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, is a list of over thirty books from his pen, and with one exception, a biography of Dr. John A. Broadus, all are upon the New Testament. That is, Dr. Robertson has concentrated his study almost exclusively upon this one field. More particularly he has given himself to the Greek New Testament, being the author of six works in this department, including the present one. His *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* is a monumental book and an excepted authority.

The Preface to the new volumes we are considering states that there are to be six in all, when the present plan is carried out. They were undertaken at the solicitation of many ministers and of the publishers. The list will include: I, The Gospel according to Matthew. The Gospel according to Mark; II,

⁷ *Word Pictures in the New Testament*. By Archibald Thomas Robertson, A.M., D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary of Louisville, Kentucky. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc. 1930. Vol. I, The Gospel According to Matthew. The Gospel According to Mark. Pp. xviii+406. Vol. II, The Gospel According to Luke. Pp. xviii+298.

The Gospel According to Luke; III, The Acts of the Apostles; IV, The Pauline Epistles; V, The Gospel According to John and the Epistle to the Hebrews; VI, The General Epistles and the Revelation of John. The inscription is "To Dr. Adolf Deissmann of Berlin who has done so much to make the words of the New Testament glow with life."

These "Word Pictures" are not designed solely for scholars, but are adapted to the use of intelligent students generally; as the Preface says, the readers "are expected to be primarily those who know no Greek or comparatively little and yet who are anxious to get fresh help from the study of words and phrases in the New Testament." The question of cost led the publishers to insist on the transliteration of Greek words; but this really serves to make the text less formidable to the reader who has never studied that language. The general idea adopted by Dr. Robertson may best be gathered from his own words:

"These volumes do not claim to be formal commentary. Nowhere is the whole text discussed, but everywhere those words are selected for discussion which seem to be richest for the needs of the reader in the light of present-day knowledge. A great deal of the personal equation is thus inevitable. My own remarks will be now lexical, now grammatical, now archaeological, now exegetical, now illustrative, anything that the mood of the moment may move me to write that may throw light here and there on the New Testament words and idioms."

The first volume opens with a brief outline of the history, date, character, structure, and title of Matthew's Gospel; and the latter part of this first volume, devoted to Mark, is begun in the same way. The introduction to Luke, Vol. II, is somewhat fuller.

As indicated above, this work deals with particular words and phrases, and so is of course not continuous. Hence there can be no review of it in the proper sense, but rather only a description. The New Testament chapter and verse divisions, usual in commentaries, are used also here, so that in general appearance the text resembles works of that character.

Here are examples of the method, omitting, however, the diacritical marks. The reply of our Lord to the rich young man, Matthew 19:21, is dealt with in this way:

"21. *If thou wouldest be perfect (ei theleis teleios einai).* Condition of the first class, determined as fulfilled. Jesus assumes that the young man really desires to be perfect (a big adjective that, perfect as God is the goal, 5:48). *That thou hast (sou ta huparchonta).* 'Thy belongings.' The Greek neuter plural participle used like our English word 'belongings.' It was a huge demand, for he was rich."

On the words of Jesus when He raised the daughter of Jairus, in Mark 5:41, we have:

"41. *Talitha cumi.* These precious Aramaic words, spoken by Jesus to the child, Peter heard and remembered so that Mark gives them to us. Mark interprets the simple words into Greek for those who did not know Aramaic (*to korasion, egeire*), that is, *Damsel, arise*. Mark uses the diminutive *korasion*, a little girl, from *kore*, girl. *Braid Scots* has it: '*Lassie, wauken.*' Luke 8:5-9 has it *He pais, egeire, Maiden, arise*. All three Gospels mention the fact that Jesus took her by the hand, a touch of life (*kratesas tes cheiros*), giving confidence and help."

When we recall that Luke was a physician the quotations following, from Dr. Robertson's notes on the first two verses of Luke's Gospel, have a special interest:

"*Have taken in hand (epecheiresan).* A literal translation of *epicheireo*, (from *cheir*, hand and *epi*, upon). Both Hippocrates and Galen use this word in their introduction to their medical works. Here only in the N. T., though a common literary word."

"*Which from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word (hoi ap' arches autoptai kai huperetai genomenoi tou logou).* 'Who' is better than 'which' for the article here. The word for *eyewitnesses* (*autoptai*) is an old Greek word and appears in the papyri also. It means seeing with one's own eyes. It occurs here only in the N. T. We have the very word

in the medical term *autopsy*. Greek medical writers often had the word. It is a different word from *epoptai* (eyewitnesses) in II Pet. 1:16, a word used of those who beheld heavenly mysteries."

It is to be hoped that the plan to cover the rest of the New Testament in this way may be carried out, for the preacher, the Bible teacher, and the painstaking and earnest student generally will find these exegetical notes a great help toward securing shades of meaning and implications not found in the usual translation.

ROBERT M. KURTZ.